United Nations

S/PV.7140

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7140th meeting

Tuesday, 18 March 2014, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Lucas	(Luxembourg)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Mr. Quinlan
	Chad	Mr. Cherif
	Chile	Mr. Errázuriz
	China	Mr. Wang Min
	France	Mr. Araud
	Jordan	Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein
	Lithuania	Mrs. Kazragienė
	Nigeria	Mr. Laro
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Oh Joon
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	Rwanda	Mr. Manzi
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Mrs. DiCarlo

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

---

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Accessible document

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

The President (*spoke in French*): In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Jeffrey Feltman, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I now give the floor to Mr. Feltman.

Mr. Feltman: We meet today against the backdrop of last week's dangerous escalation in Gaza and Israel that concluded with a fragile calm. That latest upsurge serves to underscore the fact that the status quo is not sustainable.

Eight months since the resumption of talks between Israelis and Palestinians, United States-led efforts to present a basis for continued negotiations are ongoing. We are yet again approaching some decisive timelines. Leaders on both sides are confronted with difficult decisions. Public support for peace among Israelis and among Palestinians — Palestinians both in the West Bank and in Gaza — will be tested.

The international community's commitment to engage in those efforts on the basis of existing principles has remained steadfast. On 3 and 17 March, the United States President met individually with Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and Palestinian President Abbas in Washington, D.C.; Secretary Kerry met with President Abbas in that city on 16 March and with the King of Jordan in the first week of March. In late February and earlier this month, Chancellor Merkel and Prime Minister Cameron made visits to Israel and Palestine and impressed upon their interlocutors the importance of progress on the peace track. Meeting in Cairo on 9 March, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the League of Arab States reinforced their position that all final status issues be addressed in line with principles outlined in the relevant Security Council resolutions and the Arab Peace Initiative. Quartet envoys also continued their internal consultations and met separately with the parties.

We have stressed before the importance of tangible steps to improve socioeconomic conditions on the ground, which must go hand in hand with and reinforce the political process. The urgent need for progress in that regard was acknowledged at a conference in Prague on 8 to 9 March. Jointly organized by the Quartet representative and the United States Secretary of State, the conference brought together approximately 100 international business people, Palestinian Authority officials and key figures in the Palestinian private sector. Early estimates suggest that economic activity weakened in 2013 in both the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The International Monetary Fund projects only a 2.5 per cent increase in real gross domestic product in 2014, well below the growth needed to absorb new job seekers. Unemployment reached 23.4 per cent last year — the highest level since 2010. In February, the Palestinian Cabinet approved a $4.2 billion budget for 2014, reflecting a 9 per cent increase from 2013. The 2014 budget presents a current deficit of $1.3 billion and development financing needs of $333 million.

Worrying trends continued in the West Bank. Israeli security forces carried out 292 search-and-arrest operations. Three Palestinians were shot dead by Israeli forces: a Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine activist killed on 27 February in Birzeit, near Ramallah; a civilian Jordanian citizen killed at the Allenby crossing to Jordan on 10 March; and a Palestinian civilian killed that same day near the illegal settlement outpost of Givat Assaf near Ramallah. Subsequent to Prime Minister Netanyahu's expression of regret to King Abdullah of Jordan last week, Israeli President Shimon Peres offered his deepest condolences and regret to Jordan on behalf of Israel over last week's shooting at the Allenby crossing. We continue to urge investigations into all such incidents and note that agreement has been reached to establish a joint Israeli-Jordanian investigation into the Allenby Bridge shooting.

A total of 325 Palestinians were arrested, including an alleged Izz el-Deen al-Qassam Brigades leader in Hebron on 4 March, and 128 Palestinians were injured. An Israeli soldier was also injured. Clashes also continued in and around refugee camps, in particular in Al-Jalazun camp near Ramallah, and during demonstrations against the barrier.

In five instances, Palestinian security forces defused unexploded ordnance in different parts of the West Bank between 3 and 6 March. On 5 March, they reportedly took into custody and handed over to Israeli security forces an Israeli settler detained by Palestinian farmers while uprooting olive trees near Nablus.

Settler attacks resulted in eight Palestinians injured, including two children. On 2 March, a settler vehicle reportedly fatally struck a 66-year-old Palestinian near Ramallah. Settler attacks also resulted in damage to Palestinian property. Approximately 390 trees and saplings were reportedly vandalized, including about 180 olive trees uprooted near Qalqiliya on 2 March. On 26 February, Palestinian stone- and Molotov-cocktail-throwing attacks resulted in injuries to three settlers near Nablus and material damage to vehicles, including to the vehicle of an Israeli Knesset member near Nablus on 9 March.

The Israel Central Bureau of Statistics stated on 3 March that construction in the settlements more than doubled in 2013 as compared to 2012. We are also concerned about any movement towards approval of settlement projects in East Jerusalem. Continued settlement activity in the occupied Palestinian territory is contrary to international law and an obstacle to peace.

Demolitions continued on a smaller scale as compared to the previous reporting period. Eight structures, including five residences, were demolished in East Jerusalem, displacing 23 people, including 12 children. We are concerned that, in late February, the Israeli authorities issued stop-work orders against 18 residential and livelihood-related structures in the Bedouin community of Jabal Al-Baba, which was funded by international donors to support the vulnerable community. Over 85 per cent of the residents in that area are refugees. We reiterate the importance of Palestinian access to a fair planning and zoning system.

Tensions continued to increase with respect to the Temple Mount/Haram Al-Sharif. A debate on whether to extend Israeli sovereignty over the Temple Mount/Haram Al-Sharif on 25 February in the Israeli Knesset plenary, which concluded without action, was followed by clashes on the ground and by strong Palestinian and Jordanian opposition. We call on all parties to show the utmost restraint regarding the holy compound. Provocative acts from any quarter must cease, and the sanctity of holy sites of all faiths must be fully respected. The Secretary-General underscores that incitement, whatever its source, poisons the atmosphere for peace. He calls upon Israeli and Palestinian leaders to exercise their responsibilities in halting incitement.

We remain concerned about the health of eight Palestinian prisoners on ongoing hunger strike protesting their administrative detention, five of whom are currently in Israeli hospitals. Administrative detainees should be either charged or released. We have also seen reports that additional Palestinian prisoners and detainees, who had previously announced the start of a hunger strike to begin today, have called off that strike.

Turning to Gaza, the underpinnings of the ceasefire understanding continued to be undermined. As mentioned earlier, a dangerous escalation of violence took place between 11 and 13 March. More than 70 rockets and 5 mortar shells were indiscriminately fired towards Israel, the majority of which were claimed by the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Over 50 landed in Israel, fortunately without resulting in injuries. Israel conducted 15 airstrikes on Gaza in March, resulting in the death of 5 militants reportedly affiliated with the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and injuries to 5 Palestinian civilians. A 57-year-old Palestinian woman was shot dead by Israeli forces on 28 February during a protest in the vicinity of the border fence, and another two Palestinian civilians were injured in similar circumstances. The Secretary-General strongly condemned the firing of multiple rockets into Israel and called on all actors to exercise maximum restraint. He also deplores the loss of civilian life under any circumstances.

On 5 March, Israeli naval forces intercepted a ship in the Red Sea allegedly transporting arms from Iran to the Gaza Strip. The cargo reportedly included 40 M-302 rockets with a range of up to 160 kilometres and 181 mortar shells and approximately 400,000 7.62-calibre rounds. We condemn all illegal weapons smuggling and call for the full implementation of resolutions 1850 (2008) and 1860 (2009). If the allegations of arms shipments from Iran are true, that also appears to be a violation of resolution 1747 (2007).

At the same time, the economic and humanitarian situation continued to worsen in the context of a tightened access regime and violence, both severely affecting the lives of the population in Gaza. Compounding an already dire electricity situation, the near shutdown of Gaza's only power plant was averted by another last-minute Qatari contribution of $32 million to procure industrial fuel for the plant. The Qatari contribution is expected to enable the Gaza power plant to continue generating some 55 megawatts daily for an additional 3 months. The current situation highlights the need to advance a sustainable structural solution to Gaza's energy problems.

Gaza's unemployment rate is 38.5 per cent. Extremely limited movement in and out of Gaza from the Erez and Rafah crossings continues to afflict the civilian population, including patients awaiting medical treatment. Recurrent drug and medical equipment shortages are affecting the Gaza medical system, further increasing the number of patients seeking referral outside for medical conditions that could have been treated inside Gaza, were supplies available. Approximately $250,000 per month would be required to cover the cost of those critical medical supplies. The United Nations is seeking donors' assistance to establish an emergency medical safety net while urging the Palestinian Authority and the de facto authorities in Gaza to develop a structural solution to the problem.

Meanwhile, work on previously commenced United Nations projects has not resumed as originally agreed to with the Israeli authorities, and about 15 projects, worth $14 million, remain stalled. Another 42 projects, valued at around $96 million, are still awaiting Israeli approval.

We fully recognize the complex security dimension of the situation in Gaza. However, the price should not be paid by the people of Gaza. In the context of deteriorating humanitarian and development conditions, the United Nations finds it increasingly difficult to provide assistance to the population of Gaza while restrictions on access, including for United Nations operations, persist and have even increased. We would like to call the attention of the Council to that unsustainable situation in the Gaza Strip and appeal to all parties concerned to contribute to alleviating the deteriorating conditions of the civilian population.

The Council was extensively briefed on Syria last week by Joint Special Representative Brahimi. The Secretary-General and Mr. Brahimi also briefed the General Assembly, so I will not repeat their clear messages. The situation on the Golan remains volatile, with heavy clashes between the Syrian armed forces and members of the armed opposition. Shelling continued primarily in the southern part of the area of separation and in the area of limitation adjacent to it. In a recent development, on 5 March, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) fired 17 tank rounds towards the village of New Hamadiyah in the northern part of the area of separation. The IDF informed the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force that it had taken the action in response to persons placing an unknown object at the technical fence, west of the ceasefire line. I also note that there are news reports reaching the Council of additional clashes that reportedly injured three Israeli soldiers near Majdal Shams. The upcoming report of the Secretary-General and subsequent briefing to the Council by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations will provide details of the situation on the Golan.

In Lebanon, the Government formed on 15 February submitted its ministerial policy statement to Parliament and is awaiting a vote of confidence, due on 20 March. I am encouraged by the Government's focus on matters such as respect for United Nations resolutions, including resolution 1701 (2006); follow-up on the work of the International Support Group for Lebanon; support for decisions taken under Lebanon's national dialogue; and recognition of the importance of securing Lebanon's borders, improving security and preparing for the presidential election process, which is due to start on 25 March and to take place by 25 May. It remains important that all parties in Lebanon continue to work together in the same spirit in which the new Government was formed in order to tackle the very significant security and humanitarian challenges that the country faces.

On 22 February, a Jabhat A+l-Nusra suicide bomber detonated a car bomb at a Lebanese Armed Forces checkpoint in the Bekaa town of Hermel, killing three people, including two soldiers. On 16 March, another suicide bomber detonated a car bomb in the town of Nabi Othman, in the eastern area of Baalbek, killing 4 and injuring at least 10. Clashes in Tripoli between the predominantly Alawite area of Jabel Mohsen and the Sunni neighbourhood of Bab Al-Tabbaneh broke out once again on 13 March, leading to 12 deaths and tens of injuries. Rocket fire into the Bekaa region and Syrian airforce strikes have continued, causing a number of deaths, injuries and material damage in Lebanese towns and villages, including Arsal, Labwe and Brittal. We are very concerned about the impact on Lebanon of the fighting on the Syrian side of the border and remind the Syrian authorities of the need for full respect of Lebanon's sovereignty.

In a letter dated 27 February (S/2014/134), the Lebanese authorities said that on 24 February, an Israeli military aircraft had violated Lebanese airspace, raiding the outskirts of Janta town and firing several missiles within Lebanese territory, in violation of resolution 1701 (2006). On 14 March, there were reports of a roadside bomb ambush against Israeli soldiers in the Shaba'a farms area. The Israel Defense Forces reportedly fired a number of artillery rounds across the Blue Line in retaliation for the attack. An investigation by the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon is under way. We urge all parties to fully respect the Blue Line and to refrain from any action that would constitute a violation of the relevant resolutions.

On 5 March, the Government of France hosted a ministerial meeting of the International Support Group for Lebanon in Paris, which was attended by President Sleiman and President Hollande. The meeting reaffirmed the international community's commitment to Lebanon's stability and security, including support for its State institutions and policy of disassociation. It also reviewed the progress made on the Group's support agenda for refugees, the Government and the Lebanese Armed Forces and called for greater international assistance going forward. Additional contributions were made to the joint United Nations-World Bank multi-donor trust fund for Lebanon. The Government of Italy announced its intention to host a senior officials' meeting in Rome on 10 April in preparation for a higher level conference in support of the Lebanese Armed Forces.

The recent escalation in security incidents along Lebanon's eastern border with Syria is affecting humanitarian access. As the conflict in Syria enters its fourth year, Lebanon struggles with the impact, including the presence of a refugee population from Syria of nearly 1 million people, who are in need of protection and assistance. The United Nations is engaging with the newly formed Government to help coordinate the urgent humanitarian needs of refugees and to consolidate support for the Government's national response through its road map for stabilization.

In conclusion, last week, with the situation in Gaza, we came very close to the brink of another crisis in an already volatile region. We should take that as yet another reminder of the need to work together to restore prospects for a durable regional peace. The Middle East still faces an unpredictable future with multiple sources of uncertainty. What is certain, however, is that the Arab-Israeli conflict cannot be ignored in shaping the future constructively. The Secretary-General remains convinced that a solution of the Palestinian-Israeli issue, in the form of a negotiated two-State solution, is the best contribution to regional stability that we can make at this time.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Feltman for his briefing.

I now invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion on the subject.

The meeting rose at 10.25 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.7141

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7141st meeting

Tuesday, 18 March 2014, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Lucas	(Luxembourg)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Ms. King
	Chad	Mr. Mangaral
	Chile	Mr. Errázuriz
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	France	Mr. Araud
	Jordan	Mr. Omaish
	Lithuania	Ms. Murmokaitė
	Nigeria	Mr. Laro
	Republic of Korea	Ms. Paik Ji-ah
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	Rwanda	Mr. Manzi
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan

Report of the Secretary-General on South Sudan (S/2014/158)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan

Report of the Secretary-General on South Sudan (S/2014/158)

The President (*spoke in French*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representative of South Sudan to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Mr. Hervé Ladsous, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Ms. Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, Executive Director of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2014/158, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on South Sudan.

I now give the floor to Mr. Ladsous.

Mr. Ladsous (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Madam President, for this opportunity to brief the Security Council once again on the situation in South Sudan and to present the most recent report of the Secretary-General (S/2014/158).

Little more than three years since the holding of the referendum that led to the independence of South Sudan, the country, it must be said, is in a tragic situation marked by extreme violence. The number of civilians who have been brutally killed or mistreated is in the thousands, with at least 800,000 refugees and displaced persons, 75,000 of whom are in camps of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS). Despite the signing of a ceasefire agreement, it must be reported that both parties continue to fight against one another, in violation of that agreement. With the arrival of the rainy season, we fear that the humanitarian situation, which is already extremely difficult, will further deteriorate. Moreover, the initial investigatory findings suggest that atrocities and grave violations of human rights have been committed by both parties in the course of the fighting. In that regard, I would like to welcome the news of the establishment of a commission of inquiry by the African Union.

This crisis is fundamentally a national political crisis. The conflict has spread to the whole country. No region has been spared. It is true that the violence has mainly taken place in the states of Jonglei, Upper Nile, Unity and Central Equatoria, but the political polarization caused by the conflict now affects the lives of all South Sudanese and the functioning of Government throughout the country.

That is why the mediation process, led by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), has focused on three priorities, namely, the cessation of hostilities, the crisis in the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) and the national political dialogue. As the Council knows and as I stated, the mediation process conducted by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development led to the signing, on 23 January, of agreements between the Government of South Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) in Opposition on the cessation of hostilities and on the status of detainees. Mediation under the auspices of IGAD has also led to the release of 7 political leaders of the SPLM, among the 11 who were arrested, as members may recall, at the beginning of the political crisis in December 2013.

During the second round of negotiations, the parties agreed to resolve the political conflict at the root of the internal dynamics of the SPLM. It is expected that a meeting will be held between the eight members of the SPLM party leadership — four allies of the Party Chairman, President Salva Kiir, and four of his opponents — to find a solution to the party's internal crisis. Those negotiations are to be conducted jointly under the aegis of officials from the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front and the African National Congress.

With a view to ensuring that that exercise in national reconciliation includes all segments of society, this week the mediation is convening a civil society forum where the views of civil society can be considered in determining the modalities that will allow the country to move forward.

(*spoke in English*)

A key demand of the opposition is the release of all 11 political detainees. Seven of them were indeed released on 29 January, but the remaining four remain in detention, and trial proceedings against them commenced on 11 March. The resolution of that issue will be necessary to make meaningful progress in the talks.

Furthermore, the gap between the parties on the content, objective and sequencing of the broad-based dialogue, as envisaged by IGAD, remains wide. While agreeing to the conduct of a national conference, the Government continues to insist that it be held within the country, once a ceasefire has been agreed upon and is effectively implemented. The forces opposing the Government, both the SPLM/A in Opposition and the released political leaders, on the other hand, demand the immediate start of a broad-based dialogue, in addition to the formation of an interim Government ahead of the elections.

The security and humanitarian situation in South Sudan will continue to deteriorate until the parties engage fully in the political talks, until they respect the cessation of hostilities and allow freedom of movement for the United Nations and its partners. Both parties continue to prioritize the pursuit of military gains over talks towards a comprehensive political settlement. The crisis has already affected the security of the region. The longer it goes on, the more the chances for further regional intervention will grow.

In that regard, the immediate establishment of the monitoring and verification mechanism is essential. A joint technical committee has been established, with a functioning headquarters in Juba, and monitoring and verification teams are being trained for deployment to six sites in conflict areas. With a view to ensuring effective and robust monitoring and verification, the IGAD Heads of State decided on 13 March to deploy by mid-April a robust protection and deterrent force to provide security for the monitors. This week, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and UNMISS are sending planners to Addis Ababa to work with IGAD and other partners in developing the concept of operations of the force and the modalities of its cooperation with UNMISS. IGAD has indicated that it will require the financial support of Member States to deploy and sustain the force. We shall keep the Council informed closely of further developments in that regard.

UNMISS was deployed to help South Sudan transform into a democratic State and to assist its leadership in delivering long-awaited dividends of peace and independence to its citizens. Today, the leadership stands divided, its security institutions are fragmented and the society is victimized by communal tensions. Under those conditions, and as discussed with the Council, the initial raison d'être of UNMISS no longer applies.

It is for that reason that the Secretary-General's report on South Sudan before the Council highlights the need for a strategic shift in the posture of UNMISS. Accordingly, we will temporarily put on hold activities aimed at the extension of the authority of the State and focus on five main priorities, all within a posture of impartiality. They are the protection of civilians, the facilitation of humanitarian assistance, human rights monitoring and reporting, the prevention of further intercommunal violence and support to the IGAD process, as and when requested and within capabilities.

The troops of UNMISS are operating under a Chapter VII mandate, which allows the use of force to protect civilians and ensure the safety and security of United Nations personnel and assets. The protection priority will be for those sheltering at United Nations compounds and other locations where they have sought sanctuary, which the Mission will try to support by facilitating humanitarian access. Subsequently, as additional troops arrive and conditions are created for the safe, voluntary return of the internally displaced persons, upon a request from humanitarian partners, the protection operation would spread further so as to contribute to creating the conditions for safe and voluntary returns. To implement that protection mandate, UNMISS will, let me say again, uphold strict impartiality, interacting with both sides as necessary, to reach out and facilitate access to civilians at risk.

As far as other activities of UNMISS are concerned, they will be guided by two cardinal principles. First, UNMISS will not undertake any activity that could enhance the capacity of either side to engage in military or hostile operations, and, secondly, the Mission will not participate in any activity with the parties that could jeopardize the mediation process led by IGAD.

That new posture of the Mission will remain in place until the parties finalize a comprehensive political agreement. At that time, we shall conduct a more comprehensive integrated review of the mandate, posture and capabilities of UNMISS and provide further recommendations to the Security Council.

At this point, I need to raise a very serious question. There has been a negative campaign against UNMISS and its leadership in South Sudan, which seems systematic and organized. There has been an unacceptable vilification of the United Nations by some local and national officials, with public demonstrations, media articles and harassment of United Nations personnel, including to the point of putting their lives in danger. Under those conditions we will need to consider further drawing down our staff and limiting our activities to the absolute minimum related to protection, human rights monitoring and support to humanitarian assistance.

The incident of 7 March in Rumbek, during which national authorities seized the weapons and ammunitions of a United Nations contingent, has been used to excite the negative climate regarding UNMISS. I dispatched a high-level team last Wednesday to investigate where mistakes were made in the shipping of that equipment. We offered to the Government to conduct a joint investigation, simply to prove our good faith and provide full transparency. Unfortunately, that offer was declined.

The situation is grave. World Food Programme operations have been brought almost to a standstill, despite the dire need for humanitarian assistance. Cross-border movements of humanitarian supplies — for instance, food and seeds to plant the next crop — which urgently need to be prepositioned before the rainy season sets in, are being delayed. United Nations flights are being searched, convoys stopped and personnel harassed by South Sudan security across the country. Organized demonstrations against the Mission have increasingly begun to adopt a very aggressive tone. The Mission's freedom of movement has been severely restricted, despite repeated démarches, including from the Secretary-General to President Kiir.

We very much hope that the situation changes soon, as its continuation is not sustainable, nor indeed is it acceptable. I would urge the Security Council and its members to intervene on behalf of UNMISS, condemn the campaign and request President Kiir to condemn it himself immediately and issue instructions to national and local authorities and SPLM cadres to stop it.

(*spoke in French*)

Last December's decision by the Security Council to authorize the deployment of additional troops and police units to UNMISS was certainly timely and greatly contributed to saving human lives on the ground. In the light of the obstructions to a political resolution of the crisis, the Secretary-General is asking the Security Council to raise the ceiling for UNMISS military and police personnel for one year, outside the inter-mission cooperation framework. The ceiling would therefore increase from 7,000 to 12,500 soldiers and four mobile police units.

The deployment of additional military personnel would take place in three phases. The second phase will be completed between now and the end of June, with 2,800 soldiers deployed and three mobile police units on the ground. The third phase provides for the deployment of the two remaining infantry battalions and will be realized once the Mission has re-evaluated the situation and its own absorption capacity.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that the people of South Sudan have suffered too much and for far too long. Its sole wish is that the crisis end as quickly as possible. It is now the duty of the political authorities to stop the violence, and to do so immediately. They must give orders to their respective forces to cease military operations without delay, participate in a significant and constructive manner in the talks that are taking place in Addis Ababa and work towards building a State that exercises its functions through democratic institutions and transparent processes, accountable for their acts before the representatives elected by the people. The international community was a guarantor of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement that allowed South Sudan to gain its independence. Now more than ever, it is our duty to remind the South Sudanese parties of the commitments they undertook therein.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Ladsous for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ms. Mlambo-Ngcuka.

Ms. Mlambo-Ngcuka: Two years ago, the international community celebrated with the people of South Sudan their independence, new Statehood and entry into the United Nations. Today, South Sudan has lost its peace, and the international community is called upon to help the people of South Sudan restore their hard-won peace, as violence by conflicting parties is continuing. The situation has caused a serious humanitarian crisis that has had a disproportionate impact on women and girls.

Since the current conflict began, in December, I have met with women from civil society and representatives from South Sudan inside the country, in Addis Ababa during the African Union Summit and in New York this week in the course of the ongoing session of the Commission on the Status of Women.

One month ago, I had an opportunity to visit Juba. On my arrival, I was greeted by nearly 100 women bearing the slogan "South Sudan Women for Peace" and calling for peace and the support of UN-Women and the United Nations. Those women came from all parts of the country and from all sides of the conflict. They are partners of UN-Women, as well as the Security Council's partners for peace and security in South Sudan.

During my trip, I met with President Salva Kiir, key Cabinet Ministers, including the Ministers for Cabinet Affairs, Justice, Education and Finance. I also met with donors, representatives of United Nations agencies, the Speaker of Parliament, members of the National Legislative Assembly, women leaders and displaced women living in the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS) civilian protection sites.

I was appalled at the conditions of those living in the protection sites. The onset of the rainy season has worsened an already critical situation. The density of people in living spaces was 13 times the recommended humanitarian minimum. Such conditions pose significant health, protection and security risks to girls and women. In those sites, there is only one latrine for more than 200 people, and open sewers run through the camp itself.

Women and girls have been exposed to heightened levels of violence and crime, including sexual and gender-based violence. Attacks are occurring both inside the camp and outside the camp. When women leave the camps to search for food for their families, they are also exposed to violence. The population in the camps I saw were overwhelmingly women and children. The women I spoke with were often distressed and traumatized.

Data from one of the sites indicates that 58 per cent of households are headed by women, and 34 per cent of households are missing one or more family members. Some women did not know where their children were; some had husbands who were missing or who had been killed. Many had experienced violence themselves. All expressed a feeling of not knowing their own or their family's future and were struggling to survive.

The current conflict has exacerbated the already dire conditions of poverty and violence. In addition, South Sudanese women experience the highest levels of maternal mortality in the world. More than 8 in 10 women are illiterate. A recent United Nations study found that as many as 40 per cent have been affected by physical or sexual violence. What they are facing is a matter of extreme urgency — of life and death.

The response from the international community has been vastly insufficient thus far, with only 24 per cent of the appeal funded. Our colleagues from the United Nations and other humanitarian organizations have worked extremely hard, with very limited resources.

I urge the Council to use its voice to ensure a more immediate and decisive response in support of the people of South Sudan and the agencies that are bringing relief to the country. For our part, together with our partners, such as UNMISS, we are doing our best to make sure that the humanitarian response fully takes into account the special needs of women and girls and facilitates their full participation.

During my visit, I made a commitment to initiate UN-Women's humanitarian efforts in the Juba-based UNMISS civilian protection sites, which support the commendable efforts of our sister agencies. Our focus is on providing safe spaces and psychosocial support, as well as income generation and skills training. We are also engaging in start-up literacy courses for adults and exploring ways to support education so that children and youth who are trapped in a camp do not miss out on their education during the current crisis.

The women I met in the protection sites shared the impact of the current humanitarian crisis, their concerns for the future and their demands for inclusion in the peace negotiations. Their resilience is striking, and so is their overwhelming desire for peace. They have mobilized across divisions and built inclusive coalitions. They are demanding a voice in the decisions being made to resolve the crisis and rebuild their country.

I also engaged with the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) on the representation of women in the peace talks. Today I commend Ambassador Mesfin, the chief mediator for the IGAD peace talks, for his efforts to encourage the inclusion of women. I applaud the efforts of both sides to ensure women's participation. Each has had three women mediators.

President Kiir has also expressed his commitment and has asked UN-Women to support women's representation in Addis Ababa, in addition to women who are in the delegations. However, much more remains to be done. To be sustainable, negotiations must reach beyond the confines of the two parties to the conflict. The equal representation of women at the talks, a robust role for civil society and gender expertise and analysis are needed. UN-Women has offered a senior gender adviser to the IGAD mediation team and looks forward to supporting its efforts through that and other means of support.

I also welcome the signing of the cessation of hostilities agreement and its inclusion of rape as a recognized violation. The commitments on paper will of course need to be translated into action. The monitoring and verification mechanism must be established and deployed to enforce the ceasefire.

UN-Women is ready to offer any support necessary to the IGAD efforts to increase the numbers of women in monitoring and verification efforts, to link to civil society efforts and to provide dedicated expertise on the monitoring of sexual violence. I echo the voices of women in South Sudan that urge both sides to return to the peace table as a matter of urgency, to renew their commitment to a ceasefire and to find a political solution that allows the displaced to return home and for South Sudanese to continue to build their new country. Women told me of their desire to go back to their homes and communities.

While negotiations are needed to resolve the immediate political crisis, accountability and reconciliation are equally needed to ensure that we build a foundation for sustainable peace. I welcome the efforts of the African Union in establishing a commission of inquiry to investigate conflict-related human rights violations in South Sudan and to make recommendations on accountability and reconciliation. I was particularly pleased by the announcement, last week, of the appointment of five commissioners to head that body, in particular the appointment of two women commissioners, one of whom is the African Union's own Special Envoy for Women, Peace and Security, Ms. Bineta Diop. That enables greater efforts to be focused on ending impunity. UN-Women stands ready to offer the support of a dedicated sexual and gender crimes investigative expert to form part of the Commission's team. That is in line with the support we have provided to all United Nations commissions of inquiry since 2009, largely with good impact.

The last time I addressed the Council was last October (see S/PV.7044), during the Council's adoption of resolution 2122 (2013). In that and previous resolutions, the Council made very significant promises to women to address their needs and to deliver on the commitment to women's participation. Those commitments are being tested now in places such as the Central African Republic, Syria and South Sudan.

UN-Women benefits from the attention and support that the Security Council provides as we take those resolutions to the people who need them the most. That includes briefings such as this one today and briefings that the Council receives from envoys.

Together we can demonstrate to the women of South Sudan, who continue on in the most desperate of situations, that their courage and determination can be matched by our own commitment to their cause, through stronger support for the implementation of all Security Council resolutions dedicated to women, peace and security.

Once more, Madam President, I thank you for this opportunity and I look forward to our discussion.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Ms. Mlambo-Ngcuka for her briefing.

I now give the floor to the representative of South Sudan.

Mr. Deng (South Sudan): As this is the first time that my delegation addresses the Security Council during your presidency, Madam President, permit me to begin by congratulating you and your delegation on assuming that responsibility for the month of March 2014 and by wishing you every success in your leadership. I would like to assure you of the full support and cooperation of my delegation. I would also like to commend your predecessor for her leadership of the Council for the month of February, when I had the honour to exchange views with her on the crisis situation in our country. I want to assure her and the Council that the concerns the Council asked her to share with me have been duly conveyed to the authorities at home, and I have been assured that they are being given serious consideration.

Permit me also to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Hervé Ladsous, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and take note of his statement on the operational challenges facing the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS). I also thank the Executive Director of UN-Women for her reflections on her visit to South Sudan and on the current humanitarian situation. I would like to assure them both that the Government of South Sudan will give their observations due consideration and attention, with a view to improving cooperation as we jointly engage in expediting recovery for the people of South Sudan. My gratitude is also due to Ms. Hilde Johnson, who has borne the brunt of the burdens of the UNMISS responsibilities during these very trying times.

It is of course very painful to listen to the details of the situation as just presented. We realize that all of it is strongly motivated by the desire on the part of our colleagues in the Secretariat and the Council to help the people and the Government of South Sudan. As the representative of South Sudan, my reaction cannot be one of defensiveness, denial or discomfort in hearing what has been said. All I would say, however, is that, realizing that we have a mutual interest in addressing the crisis and restoring peace, security and stability for our people, we need to see the situation, when possible, from both perspectives. It is in that light that my statement will reflect my desire — our desire — to bridge the differences and to try to work together in addressing the crisis.

Despite the difficulty our relations have been confronted with during the current crisis, the Government of South Sudan continues to sincerely appreciate and support the work that the Security Council, the Secretary-General and other bodies within the United Nations system continue to carry out in South Sudan under extremely challenging circumstances.

It is to the trauma, fustrations, pain and anger caused by the devastating violence that broke out on 15 December 2013 that much of the negative public outcry against UNMISS should be attributed. It is undeniable that, had UNMISS not opened its camps to fleeing internally displaced persons, thousands more would have lost their lives. It is also obvious that the country has nothing to gain, and much to lose, in alienating the United Nations and the international community at large. I know personally that the leadership of South Sudan, in particular President Salva Kiir himself, remains deeply appreciative of the role the United Nations is playing in the country and is unwaveringly committed to continued cooperation with the Organization.

Much appreciated also is the role played by the community of international non-governmental organizations in working with UNMISS to save lives. We appreciate the development of the crisis-response plan for South Sudan, which aims at continuing to save lives and helping the people of South Sudan begin the process of restoring peace and normalizing the situation in the country. As a Government, it is indeed our responsibility to do our utmost to cooperate closely with those who are trying to help us alleviate the suffering of our people.

The Government of South Sudan is doing its best, under very difficult circumstances, to prove to its people, and indeed to the international community, that it wishes to see a speedy end to the current conflict that is devastating our country. It is well known that President Salva Kiir is strongly committed to peace, unity and national reconciliation. The Government remains committed to the talks of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) with the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) in Opposition and has agreed to the deployment of the IGAD regional force and the monitoring verification mechanism to the affected areas. The SPLM/A in Opposition, which currently controls Nassir, Malakal and Akobo, has, regrettably, not accepted the regional force or the monitoring verification mechanism.

In crisis there are also opportunities. Since the process of negotiations takes time, South Sudan will probably adopt a two-phased approach. The first phase is to end the violence as soon as possible, along with, of course, providing much needed humanitarian assistance. The second phase will be a more in-depth discussion of what went wrong and how the mistakes of the past can be corrected so as to put the nation back on the path of sustainable peace, development and prosperity, which the people of South Sudan so badly need and deserve. We are deeply grateful to regional leaders and international partners that have assisted South Sudan in having an opportunity to discuss differences and to strategize on the way out of the crisis.

We cannot, of course, take lightly the anti-UNMISS sentiment that is reflected in the demonstrations across South Sudan and may indirectly have led to some infractions of the status-of-forces agreement. I would like to assure the Security Council that that is not the policy of the Government of South Sudan. The Cabinet discussions and decisions reflect the notion that the United Nations is indeed a principal partner of South

Sudan and represents the goodwill of the international community towards our country. Again, I speak not only for the Government but also for the President personally in saying that the Government intends to exert all efforts to calm the situation and to contain the hostile statements and demonstrations. Indeed, the Government of South Sudan deeply regrets the loss of life among humanitarian personnel as a direct result of the heightened tension in the conflict.

As I have said, I make these remarks not only as a representative of the Government but also as someone who has engaged with the authorities on all such issues. I note and should say that, during my visit to Juba for a conference of ambassadors, I requested and was granted permission by the President to visit the detainees, both the four still in Juba and the seven in Nairobi. I gained an insight of the extent to which, despite all the sharp differences, there was a profound desire on all sides, at least among the detainees to whom I talked, to end the hostilites as rapidly as possible so as to restore peace, unity and reconciliation.

Despite my appreciation for all that is said by the United Nations about the situation in our country, we appeal to the international community to appreciate not only the democratic freedom of peaceful demonstrations but also the frustration and anger inciting the people, especially when certain actions take place that give them the impression, however mistaken, that those representing the United Nations may be sympathetic to, and supportive of, the other side in the conflict. In saying that, let me emphasize that the United Nations cannot of course take sides. However, misunderstandings in a crisis situation can generate hostile reactions. As I have said before, continuous engagement and constructive dialogue are the way to correct such misunderstandings.

Much of my statement is the result of my engaging with the authorities, be it with the leadership, the President, the Vice-President or the relevant ministers. In fact, earlier today, I spoke with both the President and the Vice-President. My remarks are exactly those that they asked me to convey to the Council.

As reflected in the Secretary-General's report (S/2014/158), the Government of the Republic of South Sudan is aware that the Security Council is considering changes to the UNMISS mandate. Given the reality of the conflict in South Sudan, it is of course understandable that the Security Council will revise its priorities and look into focusing the UNMISS mandate on the protection of civilians, human rights and security sector reform. We would, however, urge the Council to continue with some of the other crucial elements aimed at stabilizing the country, as originally envisaged. As I have often said, South Sudan was rendered vulnerable by a war that raged for half a century, and ironically has now become even more vulnerable owing to the current crisis. The country is more in need of international support than ever before.

Finally, let me conclude by reiterating our appreciation and support for the work of UNMISS, and the United Nations in general, despite concerns on both sides, which, I believe, can be addressed and resolved through constructive dialogue.

The President (*spoke in French*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. I now invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion on the subject.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.

United Nations

S/PV.7142

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7142nd meeting

Wednesday, 19 March 2014, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Lucas	(Luxembourg)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Ms. King
	Chad	Mr. Cherif
	Chile	Mr. Errázuriz
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	France	Mrs. Le Fraper du Hellen
	Jordan	Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein
	Lithuania	Mr. Baublys
	Nigeria	Mr. Adamu
	Republic of Korea	Ms. Paik Ji-ah
	Russian Federation	Mr. Pankin
	Rwanda	Mr. Gasana
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Shearman
	United States of America	Ms. Power

Agenda

The situation in Libya

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Accessible document

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Libya

The President (*spoke in French*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representative of Libya to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2014/200, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the United States of America.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Australia, Chad. Chile, China, France, Jordan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America

The President (*spoke in French*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 2146 (2014).

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Argentina supported resolution 2146 (2014) bearing in mind, in particular, the request from the Government of Libya to receive assistance from the international community at a stage in its history in which the latter finds itself committed to contribute to the country's stability, institutional rebuilding and economic and social development. In that context, in the light of the principle of a State's permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, we also took into account the need to safeguard Libya's natural resources.

At the same time, we highlight that the step that has been authorized is of an exceptional nature when it comes to the basic norms concerning the exclusive jurisdiction of flag States over their vessels on the high seas. In that connection, we underscore that, as clearly set out in the text of the resolution, the authorization that has been granted is limited to vessels that have been identified by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1970 (2011). It does not cover other vessels or any other situation, including when it comes to previous sanctions, nor does it provide a basis for customary international law.

We also bore in mind that the authorization is in the context of the Council's authority, but it is also firmly within the parameters of existing international law. That body of law includes international humanitarian law and human rights law, as well as other aspects of international law. And we were mindful that, in accordance with the exceptional nature of this measure, the current authorization extends for a period of one year. We understand that, in the normal course of events, it should be superceded by another form of cooperation with Libya that makes it possible for that country to adequately respond to a situation that is essentially the responsibility of an individual State.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation found it possible to support resolution 2146 (2014), which was prepared by the United States, given the seriousness of the problem faced by Libya's central Government and its appeal to the Security Council. We agree that the illegal export of Libyan oil threatens to further jeopardize the country's stability, which already suffers from internal strife. At the same time, we would like to highlight two points.

First, it is no secret to anyone that the situation that the resolution aims at did not arise yesterday, or even when the groups active in the eastern part of Libya expressed ambitions. It predates that. I would like to recall that the first delivery of oil from the eastern part of the country made without central Government authority took place in April 2011. Moreover, in May of that year, an American company acquired oil in such an unlawful manner. The State Department of the United States, in a statement on 20 June 2011, supported those unlawful actions. The genie was let out of the bottle, and certain Libyan groups seemed to take a liking to that. If it worked three years ago, why not try today? Therefore, unfortunately not for the first time, we are having to use emergency measures to deal with problems that were created with the connivance and even support of a number of Member States, including some represented at this table.

Secondly, we assume that resolution 2146 (2014) will not affect the regime established by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, including the general principle of the exclusive jurisdiction of a flag State over its vessels on the open seas.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted In favour of resolution 2146 (2014), just adopted by the Council.

China is deeply concerned about the illegal export of Libyan oil. We support the efforts of the Libyan Government in safeguarding and maintaining national economic sovereignty and we hope that resolution 2146 (2014) will contribute to the fight against the illicit export of Libyan oil.

China calls on all parties in Libya to put the interests of their country and people first; maintain unity; safeguard national sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity together; and appropriately resolve issues arising in the process of political transition and economic reconstruction through dialogue and consultation.

Resolution 2146 (2014) clearly provides that it should not be considered as establishing customary international law and that measures adopted by Member States under the authorization of that resolution shall not affect the exclusive jurisdiction of a flag State over its vessels on the high seas. It further stipulates that, when adopting inspection measures, Member States should first seek the consent of the vessel's flag State. We hope that Member States will fully and accurately implement resolution 2146 (2014), abide by the principles of international law and protect the legitimate rights and interests of flag States.

The President (*spoke in French*): I now give the floor to the representative of Libya.

Mr. Dabbashi (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to thank you, Madam President, for having given us this opportunity to speak during this meeting. I know that the Council has a great deal on its agenda, so I do not wish to take up more than a few minutes of its time.

I wanted to address the Council today to express the thanks of the people and Government of Libya for having responded quickly to our request for it to take a position with regard to the attempts to circumvent Libyan control over our oil and concerning attacks on Libyan sovereignty over its resources. The position of the Security Council today in adopting resolution 2146 (2014) reaffirms the commitment of the Council to respect the rules of international law. Moreover, it sends a clear signal to the Libyan Government that the Security Council is prepared to come to Libya's aid when so required. Furthermore, it sends a strong signal to the people of Libya that they will not be left alone during this critical transition period.

More important than that is the fact that this resolution sends a clear message to those operating outside the law, the criminals and all those who are exploiting the weakness of the State to undermine its stability and sovereignty and embezzle its resources. This is a clear message that the international community will not tolerate such acts.

Resolution 2146 (2014) also sends a message to the world at large that the international community will be vigilant against anything leading to the loss of innocent lives and against anyone seeking to impose their will on Libya through the use of arms or to control the Libyan people by means outside of the legitimate democratic framework. This is a message to the Libyan people. The Security Council will assist the Libyan people whenever we are in need. We thank the Council for that assistance.

Finally, I would like to thank in particular the United States for having escorted the vessel in question back to Libya and for its efforts in preparing resolution 2146 (2014) for adoption today.

The President (*spoke in French*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 10.15 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.7143

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7143rd meeting

Wednesday, 19 March 2014, 10.15 a.m.
New York

***President*:**	Ms. Lucas	(Luxembourg)
***Members*:**	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Ms. King
	Chad	Mr. Mangaral
	Chile	Mr. Errázuriz
	China	Mr. Liu Jieyi
	France	Mrs. Le Fraper du Hellen
	Jordan	Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein
	Lithuania	Mr. Baublys
	Nigeria	Mr. Sarki
	Republic of Korea	Ms. Paik Ji-ah
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Rwanda	Mr. Gasana
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Shearman
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on Peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Accessible document Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746)

The President (*spoke in French*): Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Permanent Representative of Brazil and Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, to participate in this meeting.

Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2012/746, which contains the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict.

I wish to warmly welcome the Deputy Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Jan Eliasson, and I give him the floor.

The Deputy Secretary-General: Thank you for organizing this timely debate, Madam President. I know how committed and experienced you and several of your colleagues on the Council are to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Peacebuilding encompasses a variety of political and development actions by United Nations peacekeeping operations, special political missions, country teams and other actors. It lies at the heart of United Nations aspirations in countries emerging from conflict.

Just two weeks ago, the Secretary-General visited Sierra Leone to mark the closure of the United Nations peacebuilding operation, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone. The transition to the country team is under way, in close collaboration with the Government of Sierra Leone and with the continued political engagement of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The example of Sierra Leone, and of Timor Leste before it, provides evidence of how post-conflict peacebuilding can prevent a relapse into violence and underpin a country's development after conflict. On the other hand, the recent upsurges of violence in the Central African Republic and in South Sudan demonstrate the unpredictable environment for peacebuilding and the great risks involved. That is why we must always be prepared to adapt and seek new approaches based on experience and evidence.

In 2012, the Secretary-General identified inclusivity, institution-building and the need for sustained international support and mutual accountability as three priority areas for peacebuilding. Let me say a few words about each.

First, with respect to inclusivity, national ownership, national leadership and national political commitment are indispensable elements for durable peace. But peace agreements that involve only a limited number of protagonists or key actors often fail to meet peoples' needs and expectations, and therefore turn out to be fragile. While peace settlements admittedly need to include so-called people with guns, peacebuilding primarily requires political processes with broad participation and public accountability.

In Guinea last year, the Secretary-General's Special Representative for West Africa, Mr. Said Djinnit, facilitated a political dialogue, with support from the Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund. It promoted trust among political parties and strengthened the role of women, including as electoral monitors. Those were critical elements for the largely peaceful elections held in September 2013. In Yemen over the past two years, the Secretary-General's Special Adviser worked to bring the voices of women and youth into the country's national dialogue. Both examples highlight the importance of gender-responsive peacebuilding and the inclusion of women in peace processes.

Let me underscore the Secretary-General's engagement in that area, through the commitment to allocate 15 per cent of United Nations-managed peacebuilding funds to projects promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women. I am aware that the goal has not yet been reached, but it remains a priority concern in peacebuilding.

My second point concerns institution-building for fostering peace, development and social cohesion.

Inclusive institution-building in the areas of justice, education and health care can help States gain broad popular confidence and ensure that disputes and political competition are handled without resort to violence. Effective and impartial security and judicial institutions are particularly important for building respect for human rights and the rule of law. We see the centrality of institution-building in Liberia, where United Nations support for the establishment of five regional security and justice hubs has helped to restore faith in the country's security services. The expansion of judicial services and legal reforms are central parts of Liberia's statement of mutual commitments with the Peacebuilding Commission. Ssupport to the Land Commission and so-called "peace huts" has promoted the peaceful resolution of disputes. I know that the representative of Jordan is very familiar with that point.

The examples of successful peacebuilding I have mentioned depend upon sustained and predictable financial and political international support, which brings me to my third point. Where a United Nations mission is making the transition to a United Nations country team, such as in Burundi or Sierra Leone, we need to ensure continued funding for central activities. We also need to provide the necessary political support and act decisively at critical moments. As the Council noted during its recent mission to Mali, cantonment is a key confidence-building measure in the peace process. Early and reliable funding by the Peacebuilding Fund is essential for the ability of the United Nations to support cantonment.

In Somalia, the New Deal Compact has aligned donors with the priorities articulated by the Government and Somali counterparts. That has strengthened mutual accountability. In Liberia, a publicly accessible so-called "dashboard" showing the details of donor funding has promoted transparency.

I would also like to add that the African Union engagement in the Central African Republic, Somalia and elsewhere in Africa underlines the importance of working in close partnership with regional organizations in the spirit of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. Building a regional environment conducive to peace should be a critical priority for countries emerging from conflict. That will help them to strengthen fragile transitions and reduce illicit arms or financial flows.

The Special Representatives of the Secretary-General in Burundi, the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau have worked actively with the Peacebuilding Commission to ensure the cooperation of neighbouring countries and regional organizations. Last year, in May, the Secretary-General and the World Bank President visited the Great Lakes region of Africa and, together with the Chairperson of the African Union, the President of the African Development Bank and the Commissioner for Development of the European Union, visited the Sahel in November. That demonstrated the welcome joint commitment to supporting transformative work and engagement for peace and development. Similar partnerships have been developed in the Great Lakes region, where the United Nations and the European Union are working with Governments and civil society to improve natural-resource management.

Member States created a new peacebuilding architecture at the Summit in 2005 in response to the frequent relapse into violence of countries emerging from armed conflict. Given its diverse composition, the Peacebuilding Commission is well placed to help ensure the coherence of efforts and sustained attention in support of peace. I would also assert that the Peacebuilding Fund is now widely recognized for its usefulness and flexibility. But questions remain as to where and how the Commission can be most helpful and relevant. The Commission and its country configurations are working hard to play a useful advisory role to the Security Council and to bring to bear the collective weight of Member States in support of peacebuilding priorities.

We should recall, however, that the Peacebuilding Commission is a subsidiary organ of this body and, I stress, can be of optimal use only if the Council empowers it and utilizes its potential. When the Peacebuilding Commission was established — I happened to be President of the General Assembly at the time — we believed that the Council could benefit from an advisory body that could take a longer, post-conflict perspective. I would like to appeal to the Council to take advantage of the review of the peacebuilding architecture in 2015 to shape the kind of Peacebuilding Commission that will be relevant, catalytic and effective, not least from the perspective of the Security Council and, naturally, in the interests of those States that are affected. The realities in the world certainly remind us that there is a need for such a function and such a role for the United Nations. I look forward to hearing the new Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission speak on that challenge.

The challenges are many, serious and urgent in countries like Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Mali and Somalia. I am confident that the Governments and the people of those countries could gain considerably from an efficient and broadly anchored United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank the Mr. Eliasson for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Patriota.

Mr. Patriota: I also thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his statement.

The Peacebuilding Commission is pleased to contribute to the Security Council's interim consideration of the progress made on United Nations peacebuilding efforts in the aftermath of conflict. The periodic reporting by the Secretary-General to the Security Council and the General Assembly on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict offers an opportunity to keep Member States and United Nations operational entities focused on the imperative of joint and coherent efforts to prevent conflict and situations of relapse into conflict.

Peacebuilding is an expression of the international community's recognition that our collective response to conflict must be multifaceted and sustained over the long term. In that context, the Commission recognizes the importance of the main themes set out in the Secretary-General's 2012 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), namely, inclusivity, institution-building and sustained international support and mutual accountability.

The recent crises in the Central African Republic and South Sudan remind us that the nature of peacebuilding requires a careful examination of strategies for stabilization efforts and their sequencing. Collective and persistent engagement to address this systemic and ongoing deficiency must continue.

In my inaugural statement to the Peacebuilding Commission, on 29 January, I noted that, while sustaining peace is a central objective of the United Nations' peace and security architecture, we face the systemic challenge of the short span of attention and commitment from the international community to the complex and long-term challenges to sustainable peace. The Peacebuilding Commission was indeed mandated to "extend the period of attention given by the international community to post-conflict recovery" (*resolution 1645 (2005), para. 2 (c)*).

A key feature of the Commission's engagement with Burundi and Sierra Leone since 2006 has been to sustain attention to the ongoing political and socioeconomic challenges facing both countries, in which the United Nations heavily invested to re-establish security, strengthen governance structures, promote greater respect for the rule of law, support community recovery and support the early stages of the respective political processes. In support of the United Nations leadership in both countries, the Commission has advised the Security Council over the years on issues requiring immediate attention while also working to mobilize broader support from subregions and international partners in favour of the long-term political and socioeconomic dimensions of peacebuilding.

Both countries are approaching the milestone of transitioning from the Security Council's politically and security-oriented mandated missions to the development-oriented presence of the United Nations country team. An adequate transition from emergency to development remains essential but is still, to a great extent, an ideal fraught with challenges. The change in the nature of the United Nations presence and mandate on the ground in both countries calls for calibrated yet sustained attention to ongoing political and socioeconomic challenges associated with nascent national institutions and governance practices, and strong engagement on the development track.

While we continue to insist that peacebuilding must be nationally owned and that ownership comes with responsibility, the international community must also rise to the occasion and continue to help Burundi and Sierra Leone to stay the course. That is also a consistent message that the Commission and the respective United Nations leadership deliver in, and on behalf of, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia.

The importance of inclusive political processes and national institutions and capacities cannot be overemphasized. In Guinea and in Guinea-Bissau, the Commission's collaboration with the respective United Nations leadership focuses on ensuring that, regardless of the outcome of national elections, political dialogue should remain inclusive and the political space should remain available for the opposition to participate in shaping the future of both countries. No majority Government can alone face the myriad challenges facing a society emerging from conflict.

As demonstrated by the painful turn of events in the Central African Republic, elected Governments that fail to keep the various societal and political forces engaged can drive their countries towards untold tragedies. That is the advice that the United Nations overall and the Commission jointly continue to extend to the political leadership in Burundi, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

A crucial aspect of inclusivity relates to the participation and contribution of women and youth to the peacebuilding process. While women and youth endure the tragic consequences of violent conflicts, they are also strategic agents for societal transformation and emancipation in post-conflict societies. In a declaration adopted by the Peacebuilding Commission last September on women's economic empowerment for peacebuilding, our ministers recognized that

> "the economic empowerment of women greatly contributes to the effectiveness of post-conflict economic activities and economic growth" (*PBC/7/OC/3, para. 4*).

In Guinea-Bissau, I was impressed by the potential contribution of women's organizations to strengthening the economic role of women, thus helping to forge a more inclusive political culture in the country and bringing together different identities, religions and political affiliations. The transformative potential of greater participation by women in the economic and political spheres can provide an invaluable contribution to building more peaceful, democratic and prosperous societies. The gender dimension of peacebuilding deserves our continuing attention and unwavering commitment.

Building or rebuilding institutions in a country emerging from conflict is the practical expression of national ownership and the sustainability of peace. At the same time, institutions take a long time to develop into an efficient medium for political participation and for the delivery of security, justice, basic social services and economic opportunities. The Commission's observation of the contribution of nascent institutions to peacebuilding, such as the National Revenue Authority and the Anti-corruption Commission in Burundi, the National Youth Commission in Sierra Leone and the regional justice and security hubs in Liberia, confirms that institution-building must go beyond establishing and nurturing organizational structures. The capacity of the Government to sustain and empower those institutions to help in rebuilding the social fabric and generating economic opportunities remains a key challenge for the countries concerned. Unless there is a solid commitment from the political leadership, institutions may fall prey to political manipulation or other forms of dysfunction. Through its collaboration with the Peacebuilding Fund and by lending its political weight in support of the United Nations leadership and the Governments concerned, the Commission has supported institution-building related initiatives in Burundi, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

The Commission can certainly do more to support the development of strategies and initiatives that prioritize institution-building and capacity development. In areas such as natural-resource management, transparent financial management for development, domestic revenue-generation and the fight against illicit financial flows and organized crime, the Commission can serve as a platform to mobilize targeted technical support, especially in the context of South-South cooperation.

As the Secretary-General prepares to release his next report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict, later this year, the Commission emphasizes the need for deepening analysis, supported by country examples, of how the United Nations collective and diversified efforts across the security and socioeconomic spectrum of post-conflict response contribute to long-term peacebuilding objectives. There is a need to know in what ways the United Nations mandated presence and evolving operational practice has made a real difference in the countries affected by or emerging from conflict. The Commission will benefit from that analysis as it seeks to further deepen, focus and calibrate its advisory function to the Council and its support to the United Nations leadership in the field. That is a critical aspect of the Commission's early preparation for the upcoming mandated review in 2015. In the same vein, in light of the Council's presidential note contained in document S/2003/515, of 28 August 2013, regular informal interactive meetings with the members of the Security Council will further sharpen the focus on peacebuilding-related topics, particularly in the country-specific contexts.

In June 2014, the Commission will convene its first-ever annual session. The session will offer an opportunity for Member States, the United Nations system and other actors to address and focus on a peacebuilding-related theme with a view to elaborating how intergovernmental policy and political support can improve and make a difference for people in countries emerging from conflict. We trust that this annual effort can reinforce and help orient the evolving United Nations peacebuilding agenda, not least by engaging key partners from regional organizations, international financial institutions and civil society. A viable partnership with those actors is no longer a matter of choice. It is indeed a necessity, and that is where the Peacebuilding Commission has its special niche.

Finally, allow me a final word on the interrelated topics of inclusivity, institution-building and mutual accountability. While keeping a focus on the centrality of inclusive national development for peacebuilding, let us not cede to the mental habits of viewing development ultimately as a technology of security. Our efforts must remain people-centered. True peace is also built upon an enlarged sense of development, as emancipation and fulfilment of multidimensional human aspirations, including through cultural and social interconnections. I believe we can put that idea at the very centre of our peacebuilding efforts, while fostering greater solidarity and true empathy so as to dispel the logic of providers and beneficiaries through improved reciprocity and mutual recognition.

For all of us, there is much to learn from the struggles of the people facing peacebuilding challenges in their daily lives. The Peacebuilding Commission can also be an important platform for connecting their voice, promoting a network for new encounters and allowing for an active and horizontal flow of knowledge and experience. In 2014, we will have plenty of opportunities to embark on that enriched dialogue.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Patriota for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ms. Clark.

Ms. Clark: I thank the Council for the invitation to brief it on this topic.

Since the peacebuilding architecture was established, in 2005, the United Nations has made important progress in improving its approaches to peacebuilding, building on lessons learned and practical experience on the ground. Today, peacebuilding is mainstreamed across the United Nations system and is used in different contexts and situations affected by conflict and violence.

Peacebuilding has also been a driver of reform and initiatives such as the relatively new United Nations global focal point for police, justice and corrections. Individual United Nations agencies have developed their own peacebuilding strategies on the basis of their mandates and programmes.

However, there continue to be some important challenges in United Nations support for peacebuilding. For members of the United Nations Development Group, a more inclusive approach to peacebuilding than we often see today is a key priority. Achieving sustainable peace requires the engagement and participation of all social groups, beyond the main protagonists to a conflict, and urban centres. It requires meaningful participation by women, youth and other marginalized groups.

It also requires that we maintain a sustained presence at the local level in order to understand and respond to the immediate and longer-term needs of communities, including on the issues of livelihoods, basic social services, the provision of security and justice for victims. In that respect, the United Nations worked with local authorities in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2013 to investigate five recent incidents of serious crimes affecting 900 victims of sexual and gender-based violence, murder and pillage and to bring those responsible to justice.

Institution-building is closely linked with peacebuilding. However, we need to take a less narrow view of that nexus and to strengthen our understanding of how a valid social contract can contribute to peace and how international actors can support such a contract developing. Without both responsive and inclusive State institutions and a vibrant civil society, there is unlikely to be either sustained peace or a basis for long-term development.

An example of an approach that addresses both those elements is to be found in Somalia, where the United Nations is working with the Federal Government to assess and strengthen its capacities to perform core State functions. At the same time, we are also focusing on supporting governance at the local level — the level at which people most frequently engage with the authorities and to which they are most likely to turn for services and support.

Our efforts in Somalia have enabled local Governments and municipalities to collect property and business taxes. That revenue is now funding municipal services for people in approximately 16 districts across the country. Local elections are being held, waste is being collected and roads are being maintained. If trust in Government institutions is to be built following a conflict, the local level is a good place to start.

Peacebuilding requires predictable and sustained international support on the basis of clear and focused priorities and mutual accountability. In recent years, Governments and international actors have agreed on compacts or mutual accountability frameworks to provide that basis and for the ongoing monitoring of progress and dialogue. The United Nations has supported such mutual accountability processes in Afghanistan, Yemen, Sierra Leone and Somalia. We hope that more countries will engage in that way.

By setting clear and realistic goals that cover the whole peacebuilding spectrum, including building inclusive politics, security, justice, livelihoods and the delivery of social services, and by agreeing on how to deliver on those goals, we can help to strengthen the credibility of peace processes and peacebuilding and to ensure effective delivery and results.

For that approach to work, both national and international actors must be fully committed to delivering on shared goals and be willing to work together. That will help to reduce the risk of failure and to strengthen the chance of peace processes succeeding.

Nonetheless, success can never be guaranteed, nor will every individual programme in a post-conflict context produce results. Such situations are inherently risky and setbacks are frequent.

It is therefore important to better integrate risk management in peacebuilding approaches and to ensure that we are better at balancing the risks of failure of individual programmes with the importance of trying to make a difference where we can. Discussions on managing the risks of operating in such difficult environments needs to be ongoing with national Governments and with donors.

Pooled funding is one important way of sharing and managing risks together. The United Nations recently established multi-partner trust funds in Mali and Somalia to enable donors to channel funding towards the programmes that may be more difficult for individual donors to support directly. Those pooled funds enable stronger risk mitigation and management through a shared platform and divide the residual risk among several participants. The Mali Stabilization Fund has already had an significnat and positive impact on the situation in the country.

When setbacks occur in countries, as they have in such a traumatic way in the Central African Republic and South Sudan in recent months, it is important that we at the United Nations maintain our capability to support and work with local partners and to protect countries' capacities to deal with and respond to the crisis themselves.

So often, funding for vital early recovery work with communities is squeezed out during crises and local communities lose the ability to support themselves. Then, when peacebuilding opportunities arise, we are forced to start all over again from a worse position. We must find ways to address that conundrum and to ensure predictable funding for early recovery.

Let me conclude by emphasizing the paramount importance of national ownership and leadership in peacebuilding processes. At the end of the day, sustained peace and long-term development, led and fully owned by countries themselves, is always the goal of peacebuilding. We must support countries to make progress towards that goal as rapidly as possible.

That is why it is important to strengthen inclusion, institution-building and mutual accountability as crucial elements in peacebuilding and as foundations for national ownership. While crisis and conflict create many obstacles to such objectives in the short term, we should never lose sight of that long-term goal. I hope that that goal will remain a major priority in the discussion of how to strengthen United Nations peacebuilding and prepare for the review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture in 2015.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Ms. Clark for her briefing.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are grateful for the briefings by Mr. Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme. They have given us an assessment of the work, progress and challenges facing the Peacebuilding Commission.

In our statement, we will focus on the three priority areas set out by the Secretary-General in his report (S/2012/746), namely, inclusivity, institution-building and sustained international support and mutual accountability. In our view, those aspects are central to peacebuilding and to establishing the necessary conditions for progress and to prevent a relapse into new situations of instability and tension.

From an early stage, inclusivity, seeks to ensure the participation of all actors and parties involved in the conflict and of those who, suffering the consequences, are often not considered participants in the national reconstruction and peacebuilding processes.

Inclusivity can provide legitimacy to reconstruction processes and can involve and engage the population in such processes, thereby promoting social cohesion and national ownership and laying the foundations for lasting agreements. In that way, they also prevent frustration, tension and possible relapse into conflict at the same time as they allow for work on the underlying roots of a conflict with a view to reconciliation among the affected population.

In that context, we draw attention to the fundamental role that women should have in post-conflict and peacebuilding processes. We express our concern that women remain marginalized from political power and planning in peacebuilding processes and in many national processes in general, in spite of the Council's call in resolution 1325 (2000) that women should be ensured greater representation at all levels of decision-making. We must continue working towards the effective implementation of that resolution and the seven-point action plan on gender-responsive peacebuilding set out in the Secretary-General's 2010 report on women's participation in peacebuilding (S/2010/466).

With regard to building national institutions in the post-conflict phase of peacebuilding, the process of institutionalization must be adaptable and able to respond to the needs of the population, while possessing transparent working mechanisms that make their work subject to accountability. In that work, particular attention should be paid to the political and social dynamics of the country and its practices, ensuring the central importance of national ownership of such processes. Institutions that are perceived as legitimate and independent will allow for progress towards a successful transition. Such progress will strengthen respect for the rule of law and its underlying principles, which is essential for the stability and development of the country.

With regard to sustained international support and mutual accountability, we must recognize the importance of political and financial support and commitments for making progress in national strategies aimed at peacebuilding. Such efforts require certainty and predictability when it comes to resources. We therefore acknowledge the importance of partnerships, as noted in the report of the Secretary-General, with the World Bank, other institutions and the private sector. Donations must respect and contribute to national peacebuilding plans. It is the country emerging from conflict itself, with the support of the Commission and of the international community, that should designate the plans it deems most relevant. We underscore the role that regional and subregional organizations can play in providing the necessary political support to the peacebuilding process and, as far as possible, financial support.

Against a complex international backdrop, we issue a call for the work to continue on mechanisms that could provide greater certainty in the flow of resources. In that regard, I am pleased to report that my country expects to continue its annual contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund.

In our capacity as Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2009 and during our membership in 2012, we had the opportunity to learn first-hand about, and become involved in, the Commission's work to promote peace and rebuild the countries that are part of the various configurations. We acknowledge the progress achieved. However, much remains to be done to ensure the full implementation of the objectives for which the Commission was established. In that regard, we believe that the Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations could expand its scope to consider peacebuilding and establish linkages with the relevant actors in this field.

We conclude by reiterating the call to continue perfecting the relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission and improving and expanding the channels of communication between the two bodies, in particular when it comes to considering the renewal of mandates.

Ms. Paik Ji-ah (Republic of Korea): I thank you, Madam President, for having organized today's meeting. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson for his comprehensive briefing. I also thank Ambassador

Antonio de Aguiar Patriota and Administrator Helen Clark, who provided value-added insights from the Peacebuilding Commission and the United Nations Development Programme, respectively.

The issue of post-conflict peacebuilding is multifaceted and covers a wide range of interconnected values that the United Nations has pursued. If it were not for the effective condition of the entire United Nations system and beyond, the task of peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict would remain difficult. We hope that today's discussion can be another step forward towards the solidification of our shared strategy for peacebuilding in which the role of women is sufficiently taken into consideration.

As today's briefers stressed, the success of peacebuilding depends on the implementation of key priorities, such as inclusivity, institution-building, sustainable support and mutual accountability, with a horizontal focus on gender mainstreaming. Today I would like to address the challenges we face and ways to overcome those impediments to achieve progress in peacebuilding.

First, we have seen that it is often difficult to incorporate inclusivity into local political culture. Winner-take-all politics and the alienation of minorities undermine hard-won yet still fragile stability and even lead to relapses into conflict. Empirical evidence shows that if a Government fails to address social grievances, the international community loses confidence and becomes reluctant to translate their development partnership into action, which is crucial to take on the root causes of conflicts. Social cohesion through reconciliation should be the basis for early stabilization as well as for long-term prosperity. In that context, we would like to underline that women can play an important role in ensuring social cohesion and political legitimacy.

Secondly, delays in institution-building threaten the credibility of newly established authorities in post-conflict situations, as illustrated by the case of the Central African Republic. Providing basic services is critical to achieve stability and to discourage people from taking the law into their own hands.

We believe that scarce resources can be better utilized through effective coordination among the relevant organizations operating in the same areas. Similar tasks performed by each organization need to be streamlined and rearranged according to their respective comparative advantages under the "delivering as one" perspective. The role of the United Nations Development Programme can be strengthened in terms of the division of labour in relation to political and peacekeeping missions. The coordination efforts between the United Nations and the World Bank for the security and development of the Great Lakes region and the Sahel are commendable examples.

Thirdly, interactive cooperation between the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the Security Council has yet to reach its full potential. In order to create synergy, both bodies should be interdependent, not just out of principle but based on mutual needs. Both sides need to make more efforts. The PBC and its country-specific configurations should be able to provide value-added consultations to the Security Council, while the latter could be more engaged and provide enhanced feedback.

For a response tailored to meet each country's unique historical and social challenges, the Council needs to take better advantage of country-specific configurations. In particular, we hope that the PBC configuration for the Central African Republic, under the new leadership of Morocco, will strengthen cooperation with the United Nations field-based mission, beginning with the preparation process, taking into consideration the possible dispatch of Blue Helmets.

Fourthly, the Secretary-General's seven-point action plan on gender-responsive peacebuilding should be strenuously maintained. Women are too often victimized in conflict areas, and their role is still regarded as secondary, not only in peacebuilding but in the general process of development. The role of women could be maximized if and when Governments and the international community continue to systematically empower women. We long for the day when women will no longer need quotas to fulfil their full potential, as witnessed in many countries across the globe.

Lastly, we would like to briefly mention the Republic of Korea's participation in efforts aimed at the peacebuilding process. In addition to the financial contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund and the United Nations Civilian Capacities Initiative, the Republic of Korea will continue to explore ways to provide value-added contributions under our shared vision.

Mr. Sarki (Nigeria): Let me begin by commending you, Madam President, for convening this meeting on one of the very important structures of the

United Nations dealing with peace and post-conflict reconstruction and development in affected societies. Let me also thank His Excellency Mr. Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, for his briefing this morning, and Ms. Helen Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, for her briefing. I particularly wish to thank His Excellency Ambassador Patriota, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), for his briefing on the perspective of the PBC.

I recall that in 2005 to 2006 I was in Geneva when the Secretary-General's document "In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all" (A/59/2005) was being discussed and the configuration or establishment of the PBC was actualized. The PBC and the Human Rights Council gave a clear signal to the whole world that the United Nations was desirous of continuing to deepen the implementation of peace and human-rights elements all over the world. The third element, which remains outstanding, was the reform of the Security Council, which we are now looking forward to taking place soon.

Nigeria commends the Peacebuilding Commission for all its contributions to the United Nations peacebuilding efforts in the aftermath of conflicts. The example of Sierra Leone is very good testimony to the work of the Commission, which has been drawn down today because of the success of the implementations of various elements.

Nigeria also notes that today's briefing is taking place in accordance with the presidential statement of 20 December 2012 (S/PRST/2012/29), which invited the Secretary-General to brief the Council on the progress made in the implementation of the his 2012 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746).

That periodic report to the Security Council and the General Assembly on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict highlights the need to strengthen collective and coherent efforts to prevent conflicts and to avoid relapsing into conflict. We also support and encourage regular interactive meetings among Member States, through which we can exchange views on issues on the agenda of the PBC at all levels. That is consistent with the note by the Council President of 28 August 2013 (S/2013/515), which calls for a regular informal interactive meeting with the members.

The establishment of the PBC was a statement of our aspirations for sustainable peace. Its institutional structure was designed to permit stakeholders, both within and outside the United Nations system, to contribute to the realization of those aspirations in post-conflict countries. Indeed, the PBC has been the rallying point for key stakeholders in the work of peacebuilding in marshalling available resources, in galvanizing political support to countries on its agenda and in coordinating the relevant actors within and outside the United Nations system in the promotion of peacebuilding objectives. In particular, we must appreciate the contributions of the country-specific configurations, which have been rightly described as the heart and soul of the PBC, and therefore its greatest potential.

The PBC has continued to focus the attention of the international community on the political and socioeconomic challenges in countries under its mandate. The Commission's engagement in Burundi and Sierra Leone since 2006, for example, has helped highlight the challenges facing those countries. United Nations missions in both countries are now in transition from the Security Council's security- and politically oriented mandates to the development-oriented mandate of the United Nations country teams.

While bearing in mind that the primary responsibility of peacebuilding efforts rests squarely on the relevant Governments, strengthening their capacity constitutes the foundation for their success in that regard. Therefore, we call on all Member States to forge more effective partnerships with the countries concerned by assisting their Governments in building national capacity. We should initiate and support all efforts aimed at putting national Governments in charge as we continue to emphasize the need for adherence to crucial elements such as credibility, accountability, effectiveness and responsibility.

In that regard, we call on Member States to continue to assist Burundi and Sierra Leone and to ensure that both countries remain on course. The same request is made in respect of Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Liberia.

Nigeria continues to demonstrate its commitment to the peaceful settlement of conflicts, sustainable peace and development. We have stood at the forefront of global peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts, especially by standing by the United Nations in all its peace ventures, including by being a member of the PBC since its inception. From the lessons we have learned over the years, we believe that sincere support for national ownership should be a core principle in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts.

For that reason, Nigeria looks forward to the first-ever annual session of the PBC, to be held in June 2014. It is expected that the session will afford us an opportunity to discuss how to engage key partners to support national ownership of peacebuilding efforts. In addition, we would like to stress the following issues as food for thought ahead of the 2014 session.

First, in view of the fact that much still needs to be done in order to make optimal use of the PBC instrument, we expect that the session will consider ways and means by which the PBC mandates can be strengthened to attain that objective. We must continue to work to ensure that the Commission remains central and key to the development of post-conflict States and that it continues to occupy its rightful place in the United Nations system.

Secondly, we must improve on the coordination, the coherence and the clear delineation of responsibilities among key stakeholders in the United Nations peacebuilding architecture so as to prevent the duplication of effort and maximize output.

Thirdly, and lastly, we should explore ways of mobilizing support for long-term political and socioeconomic dimensions of peacebuilding from the subregions and from international partners.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): Let me thank you, Madam President, for organizing this important meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding. I am convinced that discussions of this nature can significantly contribute to the improvement and streamlining of practices in peacebuilding and post-conflict construction and initiatives. I would also like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Eliasson; the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, Ms. Helen Clark; and the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Patriota of Brazil, for their valuable contributions.

As the Council knows, my country went from a post-conflict situation to a contributor to peacekeeping operations. Our experience alone is an indication that indeed post-conflict peacebuilding is an important process in dealing with both the aftermath of conflicts and conflict-prevention. We recognize the importance of peacebuilding in creating conditions conducive to achieving sustainable and irreversible peace.

However, the international community faces the critical gap between applying existing top-down strategies and the realities on the ground. Too often, post-conflict peacebuilding is regarded as a purely operational process, using blueprints that stipulate what institutions must be established and what systems must be introduced, with technical aspects tending to take priority. Many cases of countries on the PBC agenda lead us to question whether local political mechanisms, capacities and conflict dynamics have been taken into account and whether mechanisms have been put in place to safeguard their continued existence and avoid a relapse of conflicts.

The situation in the Central African Republic speaks for itself. Despite being on the PBC agenda for nearly six years, political instability and administrative weaknesses persisted and, in 2013, the situation in the Central African Republic worsened. Community-based militias were established and the stage was set for simmering violence between Christians and Muslims. In South Sudan, although not on the PBC agenda, renewed fighting occurred in December 2013 despite the United Nations in South Sudan having a strong peacebuilding mandate.

Those two cases demonstrate that the international community in general and the United Nations in particular need to learn how to do things differently. They must adopt targeted post-conflict measures that address the root causes of a particular conflict while at the same time respecting the specificity of each situation, including the local political dynamics, cultural, religious and ethnic configurations and other elements that might play a critical role in post-conflict settings.

We believe that the focus should be on the means and potential available to the international community to support locally driven and locally defined priorities with a clear implementation plan and benchmarks to build local capacities. We are aware that building national capacities in a post-conflict situation already requires an existing capacity from a third party. In that regard, we welcome the establishment of pools of civilian capacity through the CivCaps initiative, which aims at strengthening the capacity of the United Nations system to deliver effective, timely and coordinated support to strengthen national institutions in the aftermath of conflict.

Like some of my colleagues, Rwanda also commends the Secretary-General's seven-point action plan on gender-responsive peacebuilding, which encourages Governments to directly involve women in setting peacebuilding priorities, identifying beneficiaries and monitoring implementation. In addition to the potential for women to contribute to successful peacebuilding, their participation should also be encouraged on the basis of fairness and justice. It is common knowledge that, in countries afflicted by conflicts, women account for half the population, and therefore should be part of the decision-making that would have an impact on their future. Furthermore, women are greatly victimized during conflicts, and therefore deserve to be heard.

There are many avenues through which the inclusion of women in post-conflict peacebuilding can bolster peacebuilding initiatives and thereby contribute to a positive peace outcome. For example, individual women and women's organizations adopt a variety of strategies for reducing fear and uncertainty following conflict and for fostering an environment of trust and collaboration. Furthermore, women who adopt positions of political leadership could provide a direct alternative to traditional political actors, adding to the post-conflict impetus of change and addressing the injustice of the past.

As we commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, it should be recalled that shortly after the genocide it was estimated that the majority of the Rwandan population was female. In their victimization and endurance, women of Rwanda immediately got up and started rebuilding their home country. They assumed non-traditional social and economic roles as heads of household, community leaders and financial providers, meeting the needs of devastated families and communities. Moreover, there was a concerted effort in the Government and among women's groups to address the needs of Rwandan women and engage them in the all-important processes of national reconstruction and reconciliation.

Today, the Rwandan story represents in many ways a process of collective social learning. The Government of Rwanda does not regard the aims of including women as a philosophical idea, but as a necessary practical mechanism for reconciliation, reconstruction, sustainable peace and development.

The post-conflict recovery path adopted by the Government of Rwanda since 1994 can be shared through the initiatives highlighted heretofore. In the spirit of South-South cooperation, for example, and in line with the recommendations from the 2013 report of the Secretary-General on civilian capacity in the aftermath of conflict (S/2014/5), we stand ready to work with United Nations entities that have expressed interest in having Rwanda participate in both initiatives. Rwanda has already provided high-level expertise on a number of issues, including experience and expertise in, inter alia, aid coordination, specialized police capacities, military institution-building and security sector reform.

On the role of the international community, we are grateful that within the United Nations system the Peacebuilding Commission has been given the role of proposing and advising on strategies for post-conflict recovery and of bringing together all the relevant actors involved in resource mobilization and the political, financial and technical aspects of post-conflict recovery. That continues to be an important, yet very complex and challenging, role.

But in the nearly 10 years of the PBC's existence, the United Nations and the Security Council should have been able to identify some best practices and lessons learned to make it more effective and relevant in peacebuilding activities. We also believe that the Security Council can and should contribute to the Commission's efforts to play such a role. Furthermore, Rwanda believes that the Commission can make an impact only if it is able to leverage its unique membership structure and bring political support to its engagement in the field, as well as within intergovernmental forums and through strong advocacy. The collective support from the PBC membership should focus on building national capacities.

To conclude, let me emphasize that there is a need for enhanced coordination and coherency within the United Nations and with the other relevant actors involved. We believe that the PBC should support the United Nations in delivering as one, remain focused on nationally identified priorities in the field and ensure that the United Nations entities at Headquarters and their guidance in the field missions is aligned with national peacebuilding priorities.

Mr. DeLaurentis (United States of America): I thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) Chair Patriota and Adminstrator Clark for their statements this morning.

Maintaining international peace and security is a struggle we contend with across the globe. Increasingly, we see that building peace is a challenge that we must take on with even greater urgency. Building peace requires a commitment by the international community to stay involved and a commitment by post-conflict countries to uphold the spirit of inclusivity.

A 2010 World Bank report entitled *Conflict Relapse and the Sustainability of Post-Conflict Peace* found that 90 per cent of the conflicts that occurred in the past decade took place in countries that had previously experienced civil war. The problem of civil war, the report found, is not a problem of preventing new conflicts from arising but of permanently ending those that have already started. That reality is sadly brought to life today in the Central African Republic and in South Sudan. Their relapses into conflict remind us of the need for sustained international engagement in post-conflict countries and demand of us that we examine how effective our engagement has been and how we can improve upon it in the future.

The Peacebuilding Commission and its country-specific peacebuilding configurations have helped to focus international support for post-conflict countries, build institutions, promote an open political climate and advance stability through development. With the review of the PBC coming up in 2015, now is the time to look at the impact of long-term peacebuilding and how the Council can contribute to that discussion.

We recently saw a successful example of peacebuilding in Sierra Leone, where the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone was recently closed by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in an acknowledgement of how far the country has come since its civil war. The peacebuilding mission there contributed to building strong political institutions and helped solidify gains that the Government and people of Sierra Leone had achieved. Earlier this month, Alhaji Babah Sawaneh, a former child soldier from Sierra Leone, spoke to the Council (see S/PV.7129) and offered proof of the country's healing process. Armed now with a bachelor's degree, Alhaji is an example of the good things that can happen when stability takes root.

Even as Sierra Leone enjoys stability and the United Nations peacebuilding mission draws down, we are reminded that long-term development efforts and continued economic growth are at the foundation of any sustainable peace. We appreciate the strengthened United Nations-World Bank partnership and urge greater dialogue between the World Bank and the Security Council to facilitate post-conflict development strategies. We have seen too often the recurrent issues that make countries vulnerable to relapse: erosion of inclusive political settlements, lack of Government capacity, especially in public finance and the rule of law, and insufficient economic growth and job creation. South Sudan is an example of what happens when political inclusivity is lost, as well as a reminder that we cannot let other countries slip down that path.

In Burundi, inclusivity was a key component of the Arusha Agreement that ended the conflict there in 2001. Today, we are increasingly concerned by signs that the country is moving away from that inclusive spirit. Efforts by the Government to shut down — sometimes violently — meetings of the political opposition are deeply troubling. The international community must maintain its focus on Burundi and continue to work with the Government to foster open political space and credible elections in 2015.

The post-election transition plan for Guinea-Bissau developed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Ramos-Horta, and the strategic objectives outlined by the Chair of the PBC Guinea-Bissau configuration, Mr. Patriota, are examples of how a peacebuilding office and the PBC can develop strategic frameworks and coordinate international support for institution-building. Their plans, which call for fast-tracking needed reforms, will help the Government of Guinea-Bissau to hit the ground running. By helping Governments become more responsive and better able to deliver services to their people, peacebuilding efforts can contribute to restoring Government credibility.

Maintaining international peace and security requires strong Government, but also engaged and dedicated communities. All sectors of society must be included in the peace process and throughout the post-conflict period. It is particularly critical to ensure the inclusion of women in political dialogue and mediation efforts. Truth and reconciliation commissions are an essential tool that post-conflict societies can use to help build an inclusive and sustainable peace. We urge the Government of Sri Lanka to move forward on creating such a commission to help their country heal, and we welcome their recent consultations with South Africa in that regard.

The 2015 review of the PBC and peacebuilding architecture will provide an opportunity to focus on ways to sharpen the PBC's potential. The United States attaches great importance to that review and intends to engage actively, including as a member of the Security Council, and to work closely with PBC members and countries on and off the PBC agenda to enhance the PBC's impact.

Finally, we will be successful in achieving those goals only if we have the people on the ground with the right skills and background to tackle those complicated problems. The United State welcomes the progress made in the Secretary-General's civilian capacity review. We encourage the United Nations system to apply the lessons learned from that review in planning for future post-conflict engagements.

Ms. King (Australia): Thank you, Madam President, for your initiative in convening this briefing, which provides a timely opportunity for us to take stock of the United Nations peacebuilding efforts over the past 12 months. I thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission Antonio Patriota and United Nations Development Programme Administrator Helen Clark for their briefings.

We completely agree with the Deputy Secretary-General that ensuring that we have an efficient and effective peacebuilding architecture is our collective responsibilty. We should be working on that constantly to ensure that the architecture serves the interests of those who genuinely need peacebuilding in their countries.

We will have some important opportunities to address this more systemically in the coming months, but it is also fundamental that we constantly bear in mind in the Council that the relationship between it and the Peacebuilding Commission must be as effective and cooperative as it can possibly be. We strongly support the notion of regular informal exchanges between the Council and the Commission, in line with the Council's own formal commitment to that.

Today I would like to touch upon two priority areas that the Secretary-General outlined in his 2012 report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), namely, inclusivity and institution-building. In doing so, I want to highlight the importance of the participation of women and the role of police in peacebuilding.

The Secretary-General's report has helped underscore that there cannot be any sustainable peace without inclusive peacebuilding processes. Ensuring that all the relevant actors are included in peacebuilding activities is undoubtedly a difficult and time-consuming task, but it needs to be done in order to generate a clear sense of national ownership of the path being forged.

Ensuring that peace agreements and political settlements include all the relevant stakeholders is only the first step. To reduce the risk of relapse into violence, it is imperative that the views and needs of not only parties to the conflict — those who are holding the guns — but also women, youth, ethnic groups and minorities are heard and integrated into the peace process. We need look no further than current efforts to move past conflict to peace in Syria, South Sudan, the Central African Republic and elsewhere to see that without inclusivity, such efforts will not succeed.

Yet that is only the beginning. Inclusivity must be a factor in long-term peacebuilding processes, from consolidating democracy to promoting national reconciliation and strengthening institutions.

The Deputy Secretary-General has highlighted the example of Sierra Leone. We are following a long and brutal civil war. We have witnesses a successful transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peacebuilding. With the completion of the mandate of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone at the end of March, the focus has now moved to ensuring sustained economic development. Inclusivity in the peacebuilding process in Sierra Leone has certainly been a key factor in the success of that process.

The importance of women's participation in peacebuilding cannot be underestimated. Australia welcomes the significant advances made by the Security Council in 2013, including through the adoption of resolution 2122 (2013), on women's participation in conflict resolution and peacebuilding. We must now ensure that we use that road map effectively to realize the benefits of our collective peacebuilding efforts.

Involving women's organizations is a critical part of that agenda. Such groups are often the bridge between formal mechanisms and the needs of local communities. Their views and experiences should be valued accordingly. That means their involvement in the institutions and structures that we are putting in place as part of our peacebuilding efforts. We need to ensure that women are lawmakers, members of the judiciary and advocates for the removal of laws that restrict women's access to justice and economic security.

Institution-building is a central pillar of sustainable peace. Studies show that countries with strong, accountable and inclusive institutions are 30 to 45 per cent less likely to fall into large-scale conflict. Strengthening institutions and governance at an early stage so as to provide security and the rule of law is a precondition for communities to start to rebuild. We have come to understand that requirement from operations in our region, such as in Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands, but there are clear lessons on such an approach everywhere.

The early development of a credible national police service is often an essential element of effective peacebuilding. Reverting to the issue of inclusivity, the recruitment and training of women to serve as police officers are essential elements of a credible national police service. Female police officers are better able to access women within local communities, provide the support that those communities need and better understand what may be inhibiting their effective participation in peacebuilding. An effective police service that fairly and justly services communities within the newly established rule of law will be instrumental to peacebuilding efforts.

To conclude, we look forward to the first-ever annual session of the Peacebuilding Commission and commend that initiative. We reiterate our commitment to the effectiveness of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and to fine-tuning that architecture and its operationalization. It is absolutely critical to our ultimate substantive goal, which is to genuinely tailor peacebuilding to the very specific needs of the countries concerned, to prevent a relapse into conflict and, instead, to provide a path to security and development.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Luxembourg for its initiative in convening this open meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding. I thank Mr. Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Patriota, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ms. Clark, Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, for their briefings.

Peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of a conflict has an effective role to play in eliminating the root causes of conflict. It has an important bearing on achieving lasting peace and sustainable development in countries and regions emerging from conflict. In recent years, the United Nations has been actively participating in peacebuilding efforts in the countries and regions on its agenda, where it has accumulated rich experience and achieved significant results.

The United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone recently completed its work and is hailed as a success story in the area of peacebuilding. At the same time, peacebuilding is a lengthy, complex and difficult task. Under the current circumstances, peacebuilding faces new issues and challenges that require the international community's in-depth consideration and proper response. I would like to highlight the following four points.

First, post-conflict peacebuilding must fully respect the ownership of the relevant countries, which should assume the primary responsibility for peacebuilding. The international community should fully respect their sovereignty and will and provide assistance pursuant to the priorities identified by their Governments. The United Nations and its agencies, in assisting in peacebuilding efforts, should strengthen partnerships with the countries concerned and help them to draw up integrated peacebuilding strategies on the basis of the local context. Owing to the different histories and specific conditions, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to peacebuilding. The international community should fully respect cultural traditions and the prevailing requirements of the countries concerned, pay attention to the actual conditions on the ground and not just automatically replicate past practices.

Secondly, post-conflict peacebuilding efforts should focus on removing the deep-rooted causes of conflict, with a particular emphasis on economic and social development. In post-conflict peacebuilding, the international community has long emphasized human rights, the rule of law and security sector reform without paying adequate attention to the economic and social development of the countries concerned and with limited input in that regard. We call on the international community to focus more on the economic and social development of the countries concerned. Only through rapid economic recovery and recontruction will the affected populations be able to enjoy the dividends of peace and will a solid foundation for political reconciliation, the stabilization of security and the establishment of a political basis for the peace process be laid.

Thirdly, post-conflict peacebuilding should enjoy adequate and guaranteed resources. The international community's swift and timely support in the form of assistance to the countries concerned is an important factor in smoothly achieving peacebuilding objectives. The United Nations should continue to heed the financing requirements of reconstruction programmes in the countries concerned. The Organization should also urge the international community to continue to provide assistance to peacebuilding activities within those countries and to work together to broaden the channels for financing with no political preconditions for assistance. In that regard, China commends the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund for its active role and supports its efforts to improve its work in enhancing the evaluation of the projects that it has carried and the efficiency of the utilization of resources. China will continue to support the Peacebuilding Fund within its abilities.

Fourthly, post-conflict peacebuilding requires closer coordination and cooperation by all parties concerned. The United Nations should continue to play a coordinating role in post-conflict peacebuilding efforts and should seek to establish a stable and cooperative relationship with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the African Development Bank and other international and regional financial institutions. At the same time, it should make use of the unique peacebuilding advantages of regional and subregional organizations, such as the African Union, in order to make progress in that regard. The relevant agencies within the United Nations system should have a clear division of labour and should strengthen cooperation. The United Nations Peacebuilding Commission should have a greater role in coordinating peacebuilding activities.

China has always supported peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict countries. We are ready to continue to work with the international community in helping countries emerging from conflict to achieve durable peace and sustainable development.

Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein (Jordan): I would like to begin by thanking the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing and leadership on this matter, as well as to express my thanks for the excellent briefings provided by our friends Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and by Ms. Helen Clarke, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

My comments this morning will be brief and a little bit different. I therefore respectively beg the Council's understanding in advance.

We agree that inclusivity is the key to successful post-conflict peacebuilding, but we do not agree it can be attained through political processes or through an economic development agenda alone, either separately or together, as is proposed in the Secretary-General's report (S/2012/746). Nor does it make any sense that national ownership is highlighted repeatedly when the very emphasis on the need for inclusivity makes it clear that in most, if not all, post-conflict societies — as opposed to normal developing countries — there is no cohesive nation that can go about owning anything. Own what? Owned by whom? By the nation still at war, only there is no killing and we perceive the acrimony a little less easily?

In post-conflict societies, the conflict is not actually past; it is current, present; it is there now. Only the killing is past, otherwise the conflict continues as before, only now through political manoeuvres, corruption and criminality.

That being the case, advancing the importance of national ownership is the wrongful application of ordinary development practices to a context that is markedly different, even if the two contexts share some of the same characteristics — youth unemployment, poor education facilities, poor infrastructure, et cetera. That is where we seem to have been fooled: post-killing environments and ordinary development challenges are not one and the same thing; they are different, much in the same way the PBC and UNDP were established to address, at their core, different challenges. The quicker we understand that, the better.

It is absolutely true that the path to eventual national ownership, once a country has graduated from a post-killing status, under strict United Nations observation, to weak-State status, has to — must, even — run through the inclusivity stage first, if it hopes to get anywhere. But there is a major piece missing in the Secretary-General's analysis, and that is that inclusivity cannot simply be obtained through political power-sharing, elections, training, employment schemes and the building of infrastructure alone. That approach has now run its course. It is flawed, and has failed more times than it has succeeded.

Nothing bears that point out more tragically than then entire content of paragraph 15 in the Secretary-General's 2012 report. Given what has happened in South Sudan since the report was published, the contents of paragraph 15 are a telling, if not tragic, example of how the United Nations not only missed the bull's-eye but was aiming in the wrong direction to begin with.

Inclusivity, at a level that makes it meaningful, can properly be brought about only when a deeper psychological accommodation is reached by ex-combatants and their communities in recognition of what has often brought them to fight in the first place. In other words, the deficit of trust spoken of in the Secretary-General's report can be reduced to zero only when there is also a proper resolution to the divergent historical narratives.

I will not repeat all we said on this subject in January (see S/PV.7105), save to say events since the thematic debate on historical narratives, events which the Council has wrestled with every week, have only brought into sharper focus the undeniable importance of history, of understanding it properly, of not abusing it, but finding the truth, rejecting the lies, and not just by the lied to, but more important, by the liars themselves and, after a reckoning, a settling of history, the finding of a permanent reconciliation, and one that will produce the "inclusivity" necessary for later, much-needed, political processes and economic growth.

Finally, a point in relation to women and peacebuilding: we all believe strongly that only good can come out of greater female participation in societies recovering from war. It is not just a women's right or a human right; it is a matter of basic justice, and it can only be for the betterment of the country. But it is also obvious that, in many parts of the world, very impressive economic growth was still achieved following the end of devastating conflicts, without women playing a major role in them. In other words, it is better to make the argument that even more could be achieved with the greater participation of women, rather than by saying, simply, that women are necessary for the successful economic development of a society or community.

Mr. Iliichev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We would like to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Patriota, and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, Ms. Clark, for their informative briefings, in which they highlighted the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations, the difficulties facing the Organization and the outlook in this area.

The Russian Federation considers assistance to peacebuilding as one of the key factors for the effective resolution of conflicts and ensuring that they do not recur. In most cases, countries torn apart by war or crises are not capable of coping on their own with the broad array of problems related to restoring security and law and order, protecting human rights and fighting poverty. International assistance in this regard is particularly crucial.

At the same time, we are convinced that the key to successful and sustainable results from this kind of cooperation lies in national ownership on the part of States. They have to determine their priorities for themselves, whose practical implementation should be overseen by national Government institutions that represent the interests of society as a whole.

Considerable work in the area of peacebuilding is carried out in the framework of the United Nations through peacekeeping missions and the Peacebuilding Commission and its country-specific configurations. That endeavour entails considerable difficulties and challenges that require coordinated efforts on the part of Member States, United Nations funds and programmes, regional organizations, the Secretariat and international financial institutions. Peacebuilding tasks are increasingly included in the multifaceted mandates of peacekeeping operations. First and foremost, that means assisting in the sectors of security, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, supporting the re-establishment of law enforcement and the rule of law. In general, such efforts are required to address the causes of a conflict and prevent its recurrence. Peacekeepers should not replace national bodies.

International assistance in the area of peacekeeping remains fragmentary. There is a lack of coordination in the division of labour that leads to a duplication of peacebuilding efforts, non-optimal use of resources and the squandering of available resources. In that regard, it is important that all those involved in peacebuilding work clearly within their mandates and the established regulations. The examples of Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic require a thorough analysis of peacebuilding activity, with a focus on the reasons for the lack of expected results and the failure to ensure that such situations do not relapse into crisis.

It is clear that, to achieve practical results, there is a need to continue fine-tuning the peacebuilding architecture at the global and country levels alike. The Russian Federation supports the work of the Peacebuilding Commission as one of the central intergovernmental bodies for coordinating such cooperation. In our view, its added value is to provide quality advisory assistance to the Security Council at its request on countries on the agendas of both bodies. In our view, the Commission, in the framework of its mandate, should contribute to dealing with major crosscutting issues related to peacebuilding and to the United Nations system as a whole, and that require multidimensional discussion with Member States within the framework of specialized United Nations bodies.

The events planned for this year, including holding the first annual session of the Commission and the beginning of the scheduled 2015 review, will make a significant contribution to consolidating the Commission as an intergovernmental body that plays a key role in the peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations.

Today the Peacebuilding Commission has acquired significant experience in direct dialogue with national Governments, based on mutual control in fulfilling obligations as well as through coordinating the efforts of international players in implementing the priorities determined by post-conflict countries. A positive example of that could be the stabilization of the situations in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Burundi. It is essential to consolidate those successes, including through continual security sector reform, forward-looking socioeconomic development and combating poverty and unemployment. United Nations funds should play a key role.

The Peacebuilding Fund is one of the most important components of the peacebuilding architecture. That mechanism, a term-loan facility that contributes to attracting long-term resources for rebuilding and development, has confirmed its effectiveness. On that basis, Russia has continued to provide an annual contribution of $2 million to the Fund. Providing assistance to the Fund on the basis of programmes and projects developed by the United Nations and the Government in question should take into account the priorities of the host country and ensure its responsible approach in using that kind of assistance. At the same time, it is important to ensure that countries do not become addicted to donor infusions.

We continue to consider that the country principle is key in distributing resources. We do not think that artificial priorities should be imposed on countries. It is the Governments themselves that should determine their priorities.

Mrs. Le Fraper du Hellen (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Eliasson; the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Patriora; and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Ms. Clark, for their briefings.

Two years after the publication of the Secretary-General's report on the issue of peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), I think it is very useful for the Council to once again express its views on a subject that is at the heart of the work of the Organization. I would like to thank the Luxembourg presidency of the Council for convening this discussion.

I would like to recall some principles that France considers essential with regard to peacebuilding.

First, peacebuilding implies the establishment of inclusive processes, in particular of a national dialogue — of course, one that is inclusive in the sense mentioned by the Ambassador of Jordan in his statement today. In other words, it is not just a sharing of power and infrastructure; it is effectively finding a narrative that can lead to reconciliation. It was precisely to relaunch the national dialogue that had been obstructed and a conflict narrative that was going in contradictory directions that the Council visited Mali in early February to try to put the stabilization process back on a better basis.

Working to build peace after a conflict must also include all segments of society. We support the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report designed to ensure the active participation of women in peacebuilding processes. We often say that and do little, and therefore we need to make progress in that area. In that respect, the appointment of the interim Head of the Transitional Government in the Central African Republic, Ms. Samba-Panza, and the important place given to women in her Government has, we feel, been a good example of that. Over and above the participation of women, we must ensure the participation of all sectors of society in the transition process.

Another principle for establishing the bases for a lasting peace is the need to work on justice. Justice remains the key to all post-conflict stabilization. Through its practical experience in a number of countries, the Council has identified several key areas for intervention when it comes to justice — support for the criminal justice system, independent justice, the establishment of a prison system, security sector reform and support for the international criminal justice system.

National Governments bear the primary responsibility for bringing to justice and punishing those responsible for atrocities, including those committed in post-conflict situations. But when States fail in their responsibilities, the International Criminal Court must play its part. Cases from a number of countries in which we are involved in peacebuilding — the Central African Republic, Mali and the Democratic Republic of the Congo — have already been referred to the Court.

Finally, it is essential to begin long-term work to rebuild institutions that inspire public confidence. Again in reference to the Central African Republic, up until today, thanks to the action of the African force supported by the French Operation Sangaris, large-scale massacres have been avoided. However, we face a situation of insecurity borne of the collapse of the State. It is therefore essential, parallel to security measures, to act immediately to restore the State's authority and constructive relations with the society as a whole. For that, certain basic actions need to be carried out, such as ensuring that civil servants are paid, which would get the police and gendarmerie forces back to work, as well as the courts and detention centres.

We cannot simply separate the opposing armies. We also must arrest and bring to justice those who order or incite violence. We must also bear in mind the goal of holding elections no later than February 2015.

To re-establish the Central African Republic State, those projects need resources. With regard to those priority areas, the United Nations — today through the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in the Central African Republic and as soon as possible, we hope, through a peacekeeping operation — will have an essential role to play. The international community, however, must strengthen its mobilization in order to provide the means necessary. As emphasized by Ms. Clark, UNDP has a critical role to play in that regard. It has the ability to develop policies and to mobilize, as we saw in the Central African Republic, where the UNDP has shown its effectiveness and its ability to react in recent crises by setting up a multi-donor fund.

In the face of the challenge of peacebuilding, the United Nations offers an opportunity to act in a coordinated fashion. For our part, we would like to stress the need to proceed in stages and to think carefully about the various phases of transition. Peacekeeping operations themselves have now become multidimensional, and from their deployment try to respond to varying challenges in countries where State structures have practically disappeared.

It is important that peacekeeping operations pave the way for peacebuilding. We must explain, however, that those operations cannot in one year or in a few months accomplish a whole multitude of tasks. Previous speakers today have referred to the difficulties that we have encountered in South Sudan.

Moreover, there must be close cooperation between UNDP and the special political missions or the civilian component of peacekeeping operations, so as to avoid duplication. Exit strategies must be prepared, which should guide the action of missions on a daily basis. In those complex peacebuilding processes, I would like to stress the particular importance of reinforcing the link between the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, who depend upon the resources provided by the peacekeeping operations or special missions, and the United Nations country teams, directed by the Resident Coordinators.

The country teams are expected to take over, at the appropriate moment, the leading of peacekeeping operations to ensure an effective transition towards development programmes. That is an important challenge, which we can see in countries such as Burundi and Sierra Leone. The international community must remain mobilized in those types of situations because, if we do not, we cannot exclude a relapse into conflict after the when different actors are demobilized.

Lastly, coordination among all actors contributing to peacebuilding is essential. Others before me have mentioned the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, endorsed in Busan at the end of 2011, which reminds us the necessity of coordination. The Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Fund are entities that can play a very useful role in support of activities on the ground and to ensure the necessary synergies with the missions in place. In that regard, I welcome the establishment of justice/police oversight mechanisms in Liberia that are financed by the Peacebuilding Fund and supported by the United Nations Mission in Liberia. In our opinion, those are very interesting examples of cooperation among different United Nations actors.

We are certain tha the review of the Peacebuilding Commission architecture in 2015 will give us an opportunity to go even further in terms of coordination and the further strengthening of the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, an institution in which we truly believe and which has made a lasting contribution since its establishment to strengthening States in post-conflict situations.

Mr. Cherif (Chad) (*spoke in French*): I thank the President for having organizing this morning's meeting on the peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict. I also thank the speakers for their detailed briefings on the topic.

Today, the world is ravaged by a multitude of conflicts. Darfur, the Sudan, South Sudan, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Syrian crisis, to mention but a few, are the best examples. Those conflicts have completely undone social fabrics, which have become difficult to reconstruct. Populations are traumatized and divided by deep hatred that gives rise to war, which turns sometimes into genocide. That is the case with Syria and the Central African Republic, where large-scale destruction have forced distraught populations to leave to seek refuge in neighbouring countries. To put an end to the spiral of violence, the United Nations, in its role as guarantor of world peace, mobilizes massive human, material and financial resources.

Conflict is a moment of tension with multiple potential causes — the clash of opposing political, economic and cultural interests or due to expansionary ambitions. A conflict can be long-lasting and engulf human lives and bring about human rights violations, such as rape, the enlistment of children in the army, population transfers and modifications of borders. War is a source of underdevelopment because it generates ignorance, hate and lack of trust, and is therefore a useless waste of time and energy. It is clear that military intervention can contribute to the settlement of certain conflicts, but dialogue remains the simplest and least costly of all methods.

Peacebuilding through dialogue is the way to maintain lasting and viable peace, while development assistance provides the tools for strengthening it. Africa experiences many problems that dangerously undermine its socioeconomic development. The extreme poverty of its populations is a major source of conflict. Countries such as the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, South Sudan will not experience lasting peace in the short term after an agreement is reached following national dialogue if peacebuilding is not folled up with massive amounts of development aid. To achieve that end, donor countries must work out comprehensive national strategies for better peacebuilding. They must define intervention strategies for peacebuilding in those countries when the need is felt and support national dialogue and provide development assistance, inter alia.

Peacebuilding requires the mobilization of various actors on the ground. In Africa, women are peacebuilding actors. As women and children are the primary victims of conflict, they need to be involved in the search for peace, peacebuilding and peace negotiations. Women are a positive force that is often overlooked. Women of the African diaspora can play a significant role in reconstruction and peacebuilding. Examples throughout the world show that women generally participate actively in seeking peace.

What makes peacebuilding difficult in the aftermath of conflict is not only the absence of will on the part of the parties in conflict to stop the violence, but also the refusal of parties involved in the settlement of conflicts to address the underlying causes of conflicts.

My country, Chad, experienced several decades of civil war from which it was able to escape thanks to mediation and dialogue among the different components of its society, where women are in the majority. Peacebuilding became a reality thanks to the mobilization of all parts of the nation. Today, the results achieved are appreciated by the entire international community, even if progress is still needed in some areas. Women are significantly represented in State institutions. Medical, anti-retroviral, obstetric and surgical care are given cost-free, and a mother's and children's hospital was built.

As for development, the structures for distributing aid were implemented to help women to develop income-generating revenues.

In conclusion, in Chad, like elsewhere, peacebuilding requires robust support from the international community as a whole, and in particular the United Nations.

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am grateful for the statements made by the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Eliasson; by Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission; and by Ms. Helen Clark, Administration of the United Nations Development Programme.

As the Secretary-General pointed out in his report of October 2010 (S/2010/466), an effective response on the part of the Organization requires developing a broad-based and coordinated strategy for peacebuilding, one that is based on identifying priorities on the part of local and authorities and that sets goals and concrete and achievable time frames. The report also points out that such work requires developing efforts at humanitarian assistance, establishing or re-establishing the rule of law, drafting and implementing security and justice policies, promoting sustainable development and a rigorous, democratic policy for protecting, promoting and ensuring human rights. No doubt, that continues to be an existing challenge.

Having had an opportunity to serve as a non-permanent member of the Security Council and to actively participate in the Peacebuilding Commission makes it possible for us to reflect upon profound and valuable experiences. The first that I would like to share with you, Madam, President, and with my colleagues has to do with the value of peace, which can be evaluated on the basis of its relationship with the persistence of inequality, violence and oppression. I say that because, as we have seen from our field visits with the Security Council, at the time peacebuilding work begins after a conflict, we have noted the existence of certain myths and fictions at the point of departure.

We believe that post-conflict peacebuilding has to do with communities and "doing" — that is to say, that it must take place in a concrete context that involves power and social relations, where peace is no longer clear-cut or indisputable. Although we could begin our peacebuilding undertaking with uniform, universal approaches, we would be doing so in the dark and while ignoring the underlying causes and specific reasons that led a given society to conflict. That has been a lesson that we have learned.

There are no universal approaches for working on a coordinated plan for peacebuilding, since a set of uniform practices might not adequately reflect, include or express the reality in a specific society. We all know of examples where post-conflict assistance policies have become, or been experienced as, an imposition, or have worked on the basis of a "remote control" approach in which certain generic programmes or actions are applicable, in the abstract, to any country in the world.

We know that from experience; it is one of the lessons we have learned. Such cooperation is not really transformational, but rather is profoundly inefficient, as it is not sensitive to the concrete social, economic and cultural conditions in which it seeks to achieve lasting peace and sustainable development.

We have learned that, in our post-conflict peacebuilding efforts, it is our responsibility to begin any process of change with questions, and with the ability to listen and to watch. That will lead us to an understanding of who and what causes or motives led that specific society, at a specific point in time, to actually choose to destroy its prospects for the future. That has enabled us to understand that peacebuilding is a process that cannot be imposed or administered from the outside, but rather one that must arise from the capacities and hopes and interests of each society. National ownership of that process must take place in a progressive manner. That is not only the most respectful way of achieving our goals, but also a precondition for achieving true peace.

Being a member of the Security Council has enabled us to grasp, on the ground, the need to move away from the myths and fictions that could lead us down dead-end streets or into ineffective actions to achieve peace in post-conflict situations.

One example of that, which Council members have certainly heard of, is the myth of a lost paradise. In a refugee camp in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, one often hears women say that in the past they were happy, but they lived well and were never victims of violence, and there were no problems in their communities. I think that is an idealization of a past that never existed. It can be understood as a way of grieving, and that is the way that we should understand it. But in our Organization, we cannot work in post-conflict societies by looking in the rear-view mirror at a past that never existed. It is precisely the empowerment of members of society that enables them to remember the past, even painfully, in order to be able to face the difficulties of the present moment and meet its challenges, in order to build the future that they needed and deserve.

Another myth that we encountered — again in a refugee camp, but in the Sudan — and that causes ethical tension for us, is when the presence of the United Nations or other international organizations on the ground gives rise to or permits a growing belief that the future of that community will be resolved through that presence and thanks to it, and that the possibility for those people to live in a happy society is in the hands of those saviours. To allow that kind of belief to grow is not only illegitimate, ethically speaking, but it institutionally reproduces a mentality of dependence, which defines people and countries as beneficiaries of aid and at the same time prevents people and communities from becoming subjects of change, with rights and responsibilities that they have freely taken on in order to build or rebuild a social compact and lasting peace.

In another refugee camp, a woman told us that for her, peace was a fleeting moment between two wars. That is the myth of eternal return. For her, it will always be that way — a fleeting instant between two wars. Our responsibility must be to overcome such a defeatist attitude, such a fatalistic stance. That is our responsibilty.

I would like to note the important reports that we have received and read. We in the Peacebuilding Commission and the Council need to ask ourselves which States need which kind of democracy, and which kind of democracy is needed for peace.

We have also learned that building or rebuilding a State in the post-conflict stage cannot be based on a logic of power, on the idea that "man is a wolf to his fellow man" or on enduring conflict or dissent. We have also learned that, in a post-conflict society, authoritarianism, uniformity and a hegemonic belief that there is only one right way are not the path to lasting peace. We have learned that the path to lasting peace is through a democracy that is founded on deliberation, equality and liberty and a just and inclusive society, with full respect for human rights. The paradox is that we have learned that and know it clearly, but the belief that man is a wolf to his fellow man and the hegemonic insistence that there is only one way forward persist, even in post-conflict societies, like a trap that we must seek to remove.

I have allowed myself to reflect on those abstract ideas because this kind of meeting allows us to reflect on things. Often we make decisions as if we were firemen putting out fires. I think the Peacebuilding Commission has an enormous preventive role. The idea is to consolidate peace in order to prevent violence from resuming, hate from becoming entrenched and war from destroying.

I would recall Mr. Brahimi's concept of the three circles when he told us how he saw the situation in Syria. In the Council and in the Peacebuilding Commission, the United Nations Development Programme shows us that the local level and the national level have to be incorporated into the regional level, and the regional level into the international level. It is no longer possible to think in any other way, not simply because of the Internet, but because the world is interdependent. We are interconnected, and human rights have become universal.

This is another area of tension that we are discussing today in the Council, and also in the Assembly. How can we ensure that universal human rights, which must be included in the very essence of building and rebuilding the rule of law in post-conflict societies, are not subject to opinion? How can we ensure that cultural, ethnic, gender-based, racial and religious diversity is not crushed and does not become a victim of uniformity? I think that, in our efforts for post-conflict peacebuilding, we need to work and provide assistance and cooperation to ensure that the social compacts that arise from the multifaceted identities of the various countries include, woven into their very structure, that which is non-negotiable, namely, respect for human rights. There should be a democratic debate on what is actually negotiable, that is, the diverse and pluralistic identity of a country.

I am very grateful to you, Madam President, for the opportunity to hold this debate. We continue to support the principles that other colleagues have highlighted. We thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his assessment of the implementation of the priorities identified by the Council in 2012. I also thank Ms. Clark. She is aware of how much I respect her not only on a personal level but also owing to the fact that the United Nations Development Programme introduced the aspect of human development on the basis of lasting and sustainable economic, social, cultural and environmental development. The work of UNDP in post-conflict situations provides a time-based, cultural and strategic bridge for the alleviation of the urgent needs of hunger and poverty through humanitarian development assistance from a situation of desperation to the hope of building or rebuilding a country, from the fragmentation of a country to its social cohesion. Those are of course enormous challenges.

Turning to the issue of women, children and young people, my philosophy professor used to say that it is not enough simply to include women in the electoral process in order to build a democracy. Democratic elections in which women participate are not sufficient. Women should have the right to vote. However, there must also be economic, social and political gender-empowerment and ownership among women for them to truly participate freely and equally in decision-making processes. They can then once again raise children who have seen their future destroyed, not without hope but as equal human beings.

Mr. Shearman (United Kingdom): I thank you, Madam President, for convening this debate. I would also like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General, the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for their briefings.

I would like to focus on three issues: first, improving the ability of the United Nations to plan, adapt and draw down its peacebuilding interventions; secondly, the role of women in peacebuilding; and, thirdly, the 2015 review of the peacebuilding architecture.

As others have said, the Council will reach an important milestone next week as we close the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone. The people of Sierra Leone have worked hard to stabilize their country and, although they still face many challenges, they are now on the path to a brighter future. The United Nations should be proud of the central role that it has played in helping Sierra Leone to recover from its devastating civil war. That is an example of how effective, tailored and well-planned United Nations peacebuilding interventions can improve people's lives.

In 1992, former Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali introduced the concept of peacebuilding in "An Agenda for Peace". Since then, the Council has launched numerous missions with mandates that recognize the importance not only of monitoring a ceasefire but also of building an enduring peace. Countries such as Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire, which once tore themselves apart in civil wars, have made considerable progress in building stability, aided by United Nations missions. The experience of more than two decades of United Nations peacebuilding has taught us that strong national ownership of inclusive peacebuilding processes and a focus on building national institutions are essential to securing a sustainable peace.

However, recent relapses into conflict in the Central African Republic and South Sudan demonstrate that we must constantly review and improve our approaches to peacebuilding. Peacebuilding is becoming more complex and challenging for the United Nations as new drivers of conflict, such as organized crime, drug trafficking and the illicit trade in natural resources, emerge. We must rise to those new challenges. The United Nations must improve the way in which it analyses conflict, plans and reviews missions and prepares for transitions.

In each mission setting, the United Nations should undertake a rigorous analysis of the conflict and its causes in order to understand how to focus and prioritize its peacebuilding activities. Missions must coordinate closely with their partners on the ground, including the United Nations country team. United Nations agencies, funds and programmes play an important role in delivering critical peacebuilding tasks. Arrangements such as the joint global focal point for the police, justice and corrections areas in the rule of law in post-conflict and other crisis situations are essential to ensuring a united "One UN" approach to peacebuilding.

In addition, we need systematic reviews of existing missions to consider regularly whether a mission's mix of military, police and civilian capacities remain appropriate in the light of changing circumstances in the field. Finally, we need to ensure that there is a clear plan for drawing down each mission once we can responsibly do so.

In turn, as Council members, we have the responsibility to ensure that the mandates that we provide to United Nations missions are focused, realistic and prioritized. Such steps will allow United Nations peacebuilding interventions to be more dynamic and ensure that such interventions have the right focus and capabilites to help host Governments and countries build lasting peace.

I would like to turn to the issue of women and peacebuilding, which is a high priority for the United Kingdom. Since the end of the Cold War, women have represented only 4 per cent of signatories to peace agreements, less than 3 per cent of mediators at peace talks and less than 10 per cent of those sitting at the table to negotiate on behalf of a party to conflict. More must be done to promote the role of women in post-conflict peacebuilding processes.

In that regard, the adoption of resolution 2122 (2013), last October, was a positive step forward. Thye full implementation of the resolution by all stakeholders is now key. The United Kingdom, for its part, is actively working to promote women's participation in peacebuilding. For example, on Syria, we provided the

Syrian National Coalition with negotiation training on gender issues and women's participation and played a leading role in supporting increased women's representation in the recent second Geneva Conference on Syria.

We continue to call on the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and special envoys to establish regular consultations with women's organizations and to work with civil society to support women's leadership. We also continue to call on the Secretary-General to strengthen gender training and experts in mediation teams and to support the appointment of senior women as United Nations mediators. As the Ambassador of Rwanda said, increasing women's participation and leadership in peacebuilding is a practical necessity, not a philosophical proposition.

I would like to conclude with a brief word on the 2015 review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. That will be an important moment for all United Nations bodies involved in peacebuilding activities. The United Kingdom believes that the review should not only focus on the institutions established in 2005, but also should consider the effectiveness of all United Nations peacebuilding activities and the contributions made by all United Nations operational peacebuilding divisions, including the Secretariat and agencies, funds and programmes. Since 2005, peacebuilding has moved on and is now much more mainstreamed into the day-to-day work of many parts of the United Nations system. A narrow focus on the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office will not provide Member States with a full evaluation of the effectiveness of the United Nations peacebuilding activities.

Mr. Baublys (Lithuania): I would like to thank all speakers for their interventions. Sustaining and consolidating peace is a central objective of the United Nations peace and security architecture. It is our collective responsibility to consolidate the gains that we have achieved and to prevent post-conflict countries from sliding back into violence. The sustained attention and consistent commitment of the international community and strong national ownership are critical to achieving lasting peace.

Lithuania recognizes the importance of the main elements contained in the 2012 report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict (S/2012/746), namely, inclusive processes, instituition-building and sustained international support, accompanied by strong national ownership.

The international community should also devote enhanced attention to minimizing the impact of external stresses such as cross-border conflict and the possible spillover of threats posed by international criminal networks. Internal factors, such as political exclusion, real or perceived discrimination against social groups, corruption, high levels of youth unemployment and unequally distributed natural resources could also be profoundly destabilizing for countries that have weak institutions and are politically and socially fragmented.

In my remarks, I would like to focus on two elements: institution-building and the rule of law. Under last month's Lithuanian presidency, the Council held an open debate (see S/PV.7113) and adopted on a presidential statement on the rule of law (S/PRST/2014/5). That exercise emphasized, once again, the importance of the rule of law as one of the key elements of conflict prevention, peacebuilding, conflict resolution and peacekeeping. Moreover, it unfolded around the idea that early peacebuilding starts with peacekeeping missions and that their support to strengthening rule-of-law institutions should lay foundations for long-term peacebuilding objectives. In that context, the role of the effective management of transitions, as well as the importance of partnerships and cooperation with Member States, regional, subregional and international partners, was underlined. The Council also reiterated that national ownership, responsibility and political will were critical in building sustainable peace.

Strengthening formal and informal institutions, restoring core governance functions and equitable service delivery, and strengthening domestic accountability systems in countries emerging from conflicts are practical expression of sustainable peace. Institutions take a long time to develop into a solid forum for inclusive political participation and for the delivery of security, social services, justice, education and economic opportunities. The capacities of Governments to sustain and empower such institutions remain a key challenge for countries emerging from conflicts. Strong leadership and political will are crucial.

Another important element for the peacebuilding is inclusivity. Elected Governments must keep various societal and political forces engaged and include them in the decision-making process. A very important aspect of inclusivity relates to the participation of women and youth. We constantly urge the inclusion of women in peacebuilding processes, but what does that mean in reality? Women are powerful agents of change in rebuilding communities affected by conflict. Women bring their experiences of war to the conference table. Women make up 80 per cent of refugees. They are often victims of sexual violence, and war widows. When they are combatants, they also have different needs and experiences from those of male combatants. Democratic governance, security sector reform, land tenure, justice and the protection of human rights are key elements for sustainable peace where women's interests and gender perspectives should be taken into account.

It is very important to follow the United Nations seven-point action plan on women's participation in peacebuilding, in which the United Nations committed to ensuring women's participation in conflict resolution, post-conflict building and mediation. It also promotes women's representation in post-conflict governance.

Today the Council referred to resolution 2122 (2013), which remains a key element in the expanding framework for women's contribution to peace.

In order to more effectively help countries affected by conflict, the efforts of the international community should be guided by a spirit of partnership that enhances and better coordinates the links among the United Nations civilian capacity, Member States, regional organizations, international financial institutions and civil society. I cannot stress enough the role of the Peace-building Commission (PBC) in coordinating and reinforcing the United Nations peacebuilding architecture in that regard. Increased interaction and cooperation with the World Bank and collaboration on the ground are required. The PBC role must not be reduced to that of a mere fundraiser. The discussion on how to deepen and focus the advisory and support role of the PBC is very timely and, in that context, its upcoming mandated review next year is very important.

The PBC clearly adds more value to our deliberations in the Security Council. The country-specific configuration Chairs of the PBC could participate in Council meetings at which the situation concerning the country in question is considered. There could also be greater coordination before and during country visits by PBC Chairs and Council members.

Finally, we look forward to the Secretary-General's next report on peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict later this year, which we trust will provide a basis for our deliberations on the lessons learned from the United Nations response in countries affected by or emerging from conflict.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall now make a statement in my national capacity as the representative of Luxembourg.

I thank the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Jan Eliasson, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Patriota, and the Administrator of the United Nations Development Porgramme (UNDP), Ms. Helen Clark, for their presentations. They highlighted the close links that exist between the various actors and entities of the United Nations system, the United Nations Development Group and the peacebuilding architecture established in 2005. The Deputy Secretary-General, who was one of the founding fathers of that architecture, urged the Council to embark upon a reflection in the light of the in-depth review of the peacebuilding architecture planned for 2015. I hope we will respond to that call and be able to continue today's discussions between now and the annual debate on the report of the Peacebuilding Commission, to be held in July, and beyond.

Our briefers underlined in their presentations that peacebuilding involved everybody. That is a long-term endeavour that must mobilize all the life force of a country or region as a whole, and the consistent support of the international community. There are positive examples that should encourage us in our efforts — I am referring in particular to Sierra Leone, where the transition from the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone to the United Nations country team will be completed successfully at the end of this month. I am also thinking of Guinea, where the smooth holding of legislative elections in 2013 and the acceptance of their results allowed for the transition in that country to bear fruit, on the basis of an inclusive political dialogue facilitated by the United Nations. In Guinea, all of the key players were directly involved — the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa, UNDP, United Nations funds and programmes, the European Union, bilateral partners and civil society, including women's groups and the Guinea configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission, which Luxembourg has had the honour to chair for three years now.

However, examples of relapse into deadly conflict, as in the Central African Republic and South Sudan, show that there remains some way to go when it comes to peacebuilding. Whenever human rights are violated or dynamics of exclusion or marginalization arise, or the narrowing of political space threatens the progress achieved, vigilance and action are required. That is the crux of the "Rights up front" initiative, launched by the Secretary-General and the Deputy Secretary-General last December.

Peacebuilding and the strengthening of the State also have a political dimension. We cannot ignore the realities of the political economy of a country, the underlying causes of conflict, the risks posed by corruption, governance that is not conducive to development, political, economic or social exclusion, organized crime or political cultures in which the winner takes all. Building lasting peace requires the establishment of inclusive political processes and settlements, competent and accountable national institutions, and ongoing support and attention from the international community.

We welcome the efforts of fragile States in the Group of Seven Plus and the conclusion of national agreements under the "New Deal". Mutual accountability exists not only between the Government of a fragile State and its international partners, but also between that Government and its citizens. Peacebuilding requires the achievement of a new social compact. The State should be able to fulfil its regulatory functions that confer its legitimacy. The State should ensure its responsibility in the areas of promoting and protecting human rights, establishing the rule of law and providing public services for the benefit of its citizens. As others today have highlighted genuine national ownership is essential. The process of peacebuilding has to be an inclusive one. It has to reflect true national consensus.

That is why it is also very important to ensure the full involvement of women. Women are essential actors in the peacebuilding process, as shown by the examples mentioned by the Deputy Secretary-General and some of the previous speakers. That is true in Guinea, in Guinea-Bissau, in Liberia and in Yemen.

The Secretary-General's action plan for mainstreaming the issue of the equality of women and men in peacebuilding remains relevant. It is unacceptable that women continue to be the main victims of violence during and after conflict and that, at the same time, they are marginalized when the time comes to resolve those same conflicts and to rebuild the country after the conflict.

I would also like to say a few words on the regional dimension of peacebuilding by invoking the example of the Mano River Union. Three of the four countries of that region — Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone — are being assisted by the Peacebuilding Commission. Last July, the three country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission organized a joint meeting with the participation of the Secretary-General of the Mano River Union in order to discuss challenges common to the countries of the region. Last October, those countries adopted a security strategy focused on border security of the Mano River Union, with the support of the United Nations Office for West Africa. The implementation of the strategy should make it possible to prevent conflicts and thereby build peace at the regional level.

To conclude, I would like to come back to the peacebuilding architecture established in 2005. I think we need to duly acknowledge the potential of the Peacebuilding Commission as a consultative body that could offer advice to the Security Council, and as an adviser and constructive partner for countries emerging from conflict. There is considerable scope to maximize the potential of that body. Let us do that without waiting for the results of the review scheduled in 2015.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.7144

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7144th meeting

Wednesday, 19 March 2014, 3 p.m.
New York

***President*:**	**Ms. Lucas**	**(Luxembourg)**
***Members*:**	**Argentina**	**Mrs. Perceval**
	Australia	**Mr. Quinlan**
	Chad	**Mr. Cherif**
	Chile	**Mr. Errázuriz**
	China	**Mr. Liu Jieyi**
	France	**Mr. Araud**
	Jordan	**Mr. Omaish**
	Lithuania	**Ms. Murmokaitė**
	Nigeria	**Mr. Sarki**
	Republic of Korea	**Mr. Oh Joon**
	Russian Federation	**Mr. Churkin**
	Rwanda	**Mr. Gasana**
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	**Sir Mark Lyall Grant**
	United States of America	**Ms. Power**

Agenda

Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

14-26920 (E)

Accessible document **Please recycle**

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)

The President (*spoke in French*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representative of Ukraine to participate in this meeting.

In accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedures, I invite Mr. Ivan Šimonović, Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to welcome the Deputy Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Jan Eliasson, and I give him the floor.

Mr. Eliasson: My statement today will briefly focus on the continuing efforts of the United Nations with regard to the crisis in Ukraine and the latest developments on Ukraine since the briefing to the Council by Under-Secretary-General Feltman on 13 March (see S/PV.7134).

The Secretary-General is today on his way to Moscow and Kyiv as part of his ongoing and intensified good offices efforts. He will pursue discussions in both capitals on political and diplomatic solutions to the crisis. Ahead of his trip, this morning he spoke to Ukrainian Prime Minister Yatsenyuk.

Since the most recent briefing to the Security Council (see S/PV.7134), the Secretary-General has continued to engage with key actors with the aim of de-escalating the situation. He has unfailingly urged dialogue and promoted adherence to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter in relation to Ukraine, such as respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity and ensuring the fulfilment of the human rights of all, with particular attention to minorities.

During my recent mission to Ukraine, I stressed the importance of an inclusive Government and the need to preserve a multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual Ukraine with all my interlocutors. As the Council has seen from his public statements, the Secretary-General has repeatedly counselled against hasty actions that could increase tensions and lead to miscalculations and unintended consequences.

My mission to Ukraine was followed by that of Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights Ivan Šimonović. At the request of the Secretary-General, given the volatility of the situation on the ground, Mr. Šimonović extended his visit to Ukraine until yesterday, 18 March.

In the meantime, a United Nations human rights monitoring mission is being deployed in Ukraine in order to provide an objective assessment as to what is happening on the ground. Mr. Šimonović will take the floor after me to brief the Council on his visit to Ukraine and provide further information on the work of the monitoring mission. I can add that the United Nations has closely coordinated our efforts with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), in view of OSCE plans to also deploy monitors to Ukraine.

I wish to recall that, during my mission to Ukraine, I briefed the Council on 4 March from Kyiv. I reported encountering a country grappling with a series of fast-moving and serious political, security and economic challenges.

Since that mission, the crisis appears only to have deepened. Instead of de-escalation, tensions in Crimea and in eastern Ukraine continue to rise. The Crimean authorities decided to hold a referendum on Crimea's status on 16 March, after which they announced that close to 97 per cent of those who voted did so in favour of Crimea's secession from Ukraine. The Secretary-General expressed his deep disappointment and concern over the hasty decision to proceed with a referendum with regard to an issue of such far-reaching consequences for Ukraine, the region and beyond. Subsequently, Crimea declared its independence, which in turn was recognized by the Russian Federation.

On 17 March, the European Union and the United States proceeded to apply targeted sanctions against Russian and Crimean officials. On 18 March, President Putin signed a treaty, which the Parliament of the Russian Federation is expected to begin ratifying, in order to make Crimea part of the Russian Federation. At the same time, the Government in Kyiv has committed to never accepting Crimea's independence or annexation, stating that Crimea is an integral part of Ukraine.

Yesterday, Ukraine's Prime Minister expressed concern that the conflict in the Crimean peninsula was "shifting from a political to a military stage". That followed reports that a Ukrainian officer haad been killed in front of a Ukrainian military base on the outskirts of Simferopol.

Following that incident, the Ukrainian Deputy Prime Minister and Defence Minister made plans to travel to Crimea today. In turn, the Crimean leadership has allegedly stated that Ukraine's officials would be turned back. That underscores the dire need for the immediate opening of direct dialogue between Moscow and Kyiv.

Today, reports are emerging that two Ukrainian naval bases in Crimea have been taken over by pro-Russian forces or unidentified groups. While initial reports suggest that the seizure of bases has so far occurred without bloodshed, such developments obviously carry grave risks. The Secretary-General has constantly underlined the importance of avoiding further provocative actions and of refraining from incitement.

Those latest events have heightened tensions and added new layers of complexity to an already precarious situation. We are now faced with risks of a dangerous further escalation that could have ramifications for international peace and security and have serious significance for the Council and for the United Nations.

In a broader perspective, we should recall that the Russian Federation and Ukraine remain neighbours, with close and often complex historic, cultural, economic and political ties. It is our view that it is in the interests of us all that those two nations have positive ties with each other and with the broader region. However, the first step in that direction has to be based on an immediate de-escalation and restraint in the present crisis.

I would like to conclude by quoting some of the Secretary-General's key messages recently:

> "It is clear that we are at a crossroads. If positions continue to harden and rhetoric continues to sharpen, there is great risk of a dangerous downward spiral;
>
> "The focus must be to engage in direct dialogue between Moscow and Kyiv, aimed at agreeing on specific measures that will pave the way towards a diplomatic solution;
>
> "Although it has so far proved elusive, the path towards a peaceful resolution of the crisis is still open."

It is in that spirit and in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations that he now embarks on his mission to Moscow and Kyiv.

I wish only to add that our primary diplomatic tool is constructive dialogue on the basis of Chapter VI of the Charter on the pacific settlement of disputes. The United Nations will continue to play its role of promoting dialogue for a peaceful and joint resolution of the crisis, which now has become more serious than ever.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Eliasson for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Šimonović.

Mr. Šimonović: I thank you, Madam President, for this opportunity to brief the Council on my mission to Ukraine. I joined the Deputy Secretary-General in Kyiv on 9 March at the urgent request of the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Human Rights. My mandate was to make an initial assessment of the human rights situation, to highlight the critical importance of respect for human rights in working towards the de-escalation of tensions, and to make recommendations on the way forward.

I met with individuals from across the cultural, ethnic, linguistic and political spectrums in Kyiv, Kharkiv and Lviv, including legislative and executive officials, the Ombudsperson, civil society organizations representing various communities, including victims of human rights violations, as well as members of regional organizations and the diplomatic community. My team also collected numerous written materials.

I was not able to go to Crimea, as the authorities there initially would not receive the mission or ensure its security. Eventually, on Sunday, I received an invitation to visit Simferopol. I hope that a visit to Crimea, possibly by the head of the United Nations human rights monitoring mission, Mr. Armen Harutyunyan, will soon take place. I also welcome the request made on 19 March by the Independent Expert on the minority issues to visit Ukraine. I hope that the mission will take place as soon as possible and contribute to decreasing tensions.

Chronic human rights violations were among the major reasons for the upheaval in Ukraine in recent months. For many years, there have been concerns about the weak rule of law, the lack of accountability and resulting impunity. The right to a fair trial, equal access to justice, cases of torture, ill-treatment and poor detention conditions are all matters of long-standing concern. The lack of independence of the judiciary must be remedied and the reform of the security sector and of the Prosecutor's Office are also urgent tasks. Corruption is a cross-cutting problem that affects the rule of law, as well as equal access to public services, and also needs to be addressed swiftly.

All reforms and new policy measures must be adopted without any spirit of revenge and in a consultative, transparent and inclusive manner. It is crucial to ensure that one does not respond to human rights violations with other human rights violations. In the context of ongoing legislative measures concerning lustration, those must fully respect human rights and the rule of law, including the right to individual review and to appeal.

Let me now move to protest-related violations. In the context of the recent protests in Kyiv and elsewhere, I am deeply concerned about alleged gross human rights violations, including the excessive use of force and extrajudicial killings, torture, disappearances and arbitrary arrests and detentions. The actions of snipers on the Maidan are of particularly grave concern and need to be fully investigated. More than 100 people, mostly protesters, but also some members of the security forces, have also lost their lives and many more were injured. I visited protest-related victims in the hospital. I also spoke to physicians who helped victims in makeshift hospitals, including the current Minister of Health, Mr. Oleh Musiy, and Ms. Olga Bogomolets. All of them confirmed that sniper killings of protesters were undertaken in the style of an execution, in which heads and chests were targeted. The perpetrators of those and other human rights violations against all victims must be promptly brought to justice, whatever their background, status or affiliation, following independent, impartial and thorough investigations.

Let me turn now to the ongoing violations and the way to address them. I have urged all the authorities I encountered to ensure inclusivity in governance and, while ensuring freedom of expression, to curb hate speech. Ukraine is a multi-ethnic, multilingual and multicultural country. Nationalistic rhetoric and policies will be counterproductive and will further deepen the internal dividing lines within society. All views should be expressed freely in a democracy, as long as their expression does not incite hatred and violence against others. Any attempt to escalate the violence and hatred should be prevented, or stopped when it has occurred, before it escalates into further violence. It is incumbent upon all authorities to ensure equal protection for all, especially for minority groups.

The hasty repeal of the law on languages by Parliament was a mistake. The decision of Parliament was fortunately not approved by the acting President, so that the old law will continue to be in force while a new text is prepared. That process should be done in full consultation with all concerned and be fully participatory, transparent and inclusive.

During my visit, I met with a wide range of representatives of civil society, including with representatives of ethnic Russians. There seem to be some cases where members of the Russian minority have been harassed or even attacked, such as in the case of the attack against a member of Parliament. All allegations of human rights violations, in particular against minorities, have to be thoroughly investigated. However, it seems that those violations are neither widespread nor systematic.

I have serious concerns about the situation in Crimea, which remains tense with respect to the protection of human rights. I have met with victims of arbitrary arrest and detention, torture and ill-treatment and other human rights violations. I spoke to representatives of displaced Tatar persons in Lviv, Chairman of the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People, Mr. Refat Chubarov, and Mr. Nadir Bekirov, President of the Foundation for Research and Support of Indigenous Peoples of Crimea. I am deeply concerned about the human rights of those who oppose the recent political events in Crimea. It has been reported that a local Crimean Tatar activist who disappeared after participating in a protest on 3 March was found dead on 16 March in a forest near the town of Belogorsk. According to reports from credible sources, his body bore marks that suggest he had been subjected to mistreatment.

In addition to cases of violence between various political Ukrainian and Russian groups, with the alleged participation of groups from outside of the region, resulting in recent deaths and injuries, the spreading of rumours, including through the media, particularly in eastern Ukraine, is adding to a sense of insecurity among the population. I understand that this is partly due to rumours and perceptions about whether the new authorities in Kyiv would ensure decentralization policies, an inclusive Government and protect and support the use of the Russian language.

There is an urgent need for independent monitors to objectively assess and report on human rights violations, as well as on the implications of recent events and to monitor the current human rights situation throughout the country. An independent, objective establishment of the facts and circumstances surrounding alleged human rights violations can help investigation, can prevent further occurrences and can counter the spread of false information.

We have received a request from the acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine to dispatch human rights monitors, and we have immediately begun their deployment. The team will be composed of 9 international and approximately 25 national staff. The head of the human rights monitoring mission arrived last week, and others are gradually joining him. By Friday, monitors will be in place in Kharkiv and in Donetsk.

In the roll-out of that mission, we will work very closely with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), which has plans for a larger monitoring mission. Both the Deputy Secretary-General and I have maintained close contacts with the OSCE leadership in that regard, and that will be replicated on the ground.

The United Nations stands ready to help ensure human rights are respected and protected in Ukraine with the support of international and regional organizations, including the OSCE, the Council of Europe and others. In addition to monitoring the human rights situation, the United Nations can assist by providing technical assistance for legislative and other reforms necessary to ensure that the recommendations received by Ukraine from United Nations human rights mechanisms are fully implemented so that they can effectively contribute to both peace and development efforts.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Šimonović for his briefing.

I now give the floor to the representative of Ukraine.

Mr. Sergeyev (Ukraine): I thank the Council for convening this meeting and for inviting me.

I would like to start by expressing my gratitude to all Council members who addressed my Mission today with words of condolences to the family of the Ukrainian soldier who was killed yesterday after being shot in his neck when a group of gunmen stormed the Ukrainian military base in the north-east of Crimea, in Simferopol. Yesterday our Foreign Minister protested against all hostile and provocative actions of the Russian Federdation's armed forces, which caused the death of the Ukrainian soldier.

Today we observed tremendous changes in the situation in Crimea, but unfortunately those changes are not for good. As we have envisaged in other previous statements, the illegitimate referendum on the issue of the annexation of the territory of Crimea to the Russian Federation was conducted in an expedited manner on 16 March. Following immediately after the referendum, on 18 March, the President of the Russian Federation defiantly signed the agreement on its accession to the Russian Federation, which is supposed to be ratified by the Parliament of the Russian Federation on 21 March.

We consider all those acts to be illegitimate and we call upon the entire civilized world not to recognize the illegitimately declared independence of Crimea and its violent dismembering from the territory of the country.

I would like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights for their important briefings on the situation of human rights in Ukraine. For our part, I would like to say only that the real violation of human rights is taking place on the territory of the Crimean peninsula, which is currently under the total control of the illegitimate authorities of Crimea.

First of all, there are serious reservations about the expressed free will of the population of that region of Ukraine, because since 26 February, the armed forces of the Russian Federation have, de facto, occupied Crimea. Let me provide the Council with some of the facts of the human rights violations that occurred during the illegal referendum.

Some ballots were distributed to voters who were not registered at the voting site, including nationals of other countries. Russian citizens with a residency permit in Simferopol were able to get a ballot for the referendum and in fact to vote. But those who did not go to polling stations were visited by mobile voting teams, escorted by police, thus forcing people to vote. Journalists were banned, despite having valid credentials.

Additional voters lists included large numbers of citizens who were not qualified to vote. Contrary to existing elections provisions, ballots were issued immediately after submitting a registration application to a supplementary list, without a vote by the Commission members having taken place.

Even the results of the illegal referendum are very doubtful because of the decision made by the Crimean Tartars — who include about 300,000 people — to boycott. Ethnic Ukrainians, who make up about half a million people, and national minority populations in Crimea did not take part in the referendum. The referendum ballots indicated two questions as options, neither of which provided for maintaining the present status as the Autonomous Republic of Crimea; rather, they only referred to accession to the Russian Federation.

The personalities of foreign observers who were invited to Crimea to monitor the referendum raised serious doubts regarding impartiality.

Once again, I would like to emphasize the illegality of the referendum. Even without regard for the laws or sovereign territorial jurisdiction of Ukraine, of which the Autonomous Republic of Crimea is a subject, self-proclaimed authorities in Crimea held a referendum on 16 March that violated not only Ukraine's current legislation but also the fundamental rules of international law enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the Statute of the Council of Europe and other documents, including of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the 1991 Alma-Ata Declaration regarding the Commonwealth of Independent States.

An abundance of evidence, including photographs and videotaped materials, eyewitness accounts of events, including those of foreign nationals, prove that the conditions of the so-called referendum failed to meet the democratic standards of referendums developed under the framework of the OSCE and the Council of Europe. The declaration of independence by the Crimean Republic is a direct consequence of the application of the use of force and threats against Ukraine by the Russian Federation. Given the Russian nuclear power status, the situation is particularly dangerous in terms of Ukraine's independence and territorial integrity and for international peace and security in general.

Accordingly, I assert that, on the basis of customary norms and international law, the international community is obliged not to recognize Crimea as a subject of international law, or any situation, treaty or agreement that may arise or be achieved by that territory.

My country expresses its strong and imperative protest against the recognition of the Russian Federation of the self-proclaimed republic, as a matter of international law. Those actions by the Russian side do not meet the international obligations of the Russian Federation in relation to its multilateral and bilateral agreements guaranteeing the territorial integrity of Ukraine, the integrity and inviolability of borders and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

The independence of that formation was declared by an illegitimate authority based on the results of the anti-constitutional referendum held under outrageous violations of the democratic standards. Russia's recognition of the self-proclaimed republic of Crimea has one single goal: to create pseudo-legitimate reasons for the annexation of the territory of Ukraine and its incorporation into the Russian Federation.

We are seriously concerned about the security of the ethnic Ukrainians, Ukrainian Tartars, Karaims and other ethnic groups living in Crimea that have not supported the so-called referendum. Their lives are seriously threatened.

In conclusion, I would like to echo my Council colleagues. Ukraine and the entire civilized world will never recognize the illegitimately declared independence of Crimea and its accession to the Russian Federation.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall now give the floor to the members of the Council.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Eliasson and Mr. Šimonović for their statements, as well as the Permanent Representative of Ukraine for his. This past Saturday, the international community sent a unanimous message to Russia on behalf of the Council, to whit, that the referendum it had instigated in Crimea was illegal and null and void under international law. Russia's veto changed nothing — quite the contrary. The illegal act of separating Crimea, which had been in preparation since a long time, appeared all the more blatant.

Yesterday Crimea was annexed by Russia, despite the picture painted that has fooled no one. The annexation was accompanied by flags, drums and trumpets forming a gathering wave of aggressive nationalism, the future consequences of which, once it is awoken, are unknown; nationalism that never leads to anything good, a nationalism that is used to mask or to justify attempts to suppress civil rights.

Moreover, little effort has been made to hide the use of force. The referendum was hastily organized, Russian soldiers were everywhere. Nothing was left to chance. The media was controlled at the level of describing events, international observers were recruited from among the far-right European parties and if fascists are part of the story, they are certainly not where they are claimed to be. Finally, the final results appeared so excessive that they lost all meaning. How could more than 86 per cent of the people have voted, when some communities — particularly the Crimean Tartars and Ukrainians that represent nearly 14 per cent of the population — had called for a boycott.

The United Nations was created to ensure that one would no longer witness such spectacles which dishonour the organizers and in effect reflect upon the entire international community. The rule of law must guide relations among States. The acquisition of territory resulting from the use of force or even from simple threats is simply unacceptable. That principle that Russia subscribed to in the early days is our code. I would call it the DNA of the Organization. As I stated on Saturday (see S/PV.7138), by voting against the draft resolution, it is the Charter of the United Nations that Russia has in effect vetoed.

We have just heard from Mr. Šimonović that nothing in Ukraine justified references to extremely serious attacks on human rights or minorities placed in critical situations. If any serious human rights violations have occurred, it was during the time of Yanukovych.

At least we are reassured regarding the situation throughout the country. The authorities in Kyiv are endeavoring to extend their hand to all of the various components of Ukrainian society. Nothing will justify in the long-term the current discussion about an irresponsible Government whose actions could lead to fear among its populations.

In terms of the protection of Russian and Russian language populations in Ukraine invoked by Moscow to justify its intervention in Ukraine — it is again clear that it does not correspond to the reality of the situation, nor is it a legal justification of the military occupation of a territory of a sovereign State and it becomes even less relevant when used as a pretext to extend its own borders.

We continue to recall that minorities in Ukraine, including religious and language minorities, must be protected. That falls first and foremost to the transition authorities — and that is what they are doing. The situation in Kyiv, L'viv, Donets'k or Kharkiv should not concern the Council. It is in Sevastopol and Simferopol that the law is being flouted, militiamen terrorize those who will not give in to force, and Ukrainian soldiers are being killed simply because they refuse to surrender.

Faced with a Russia that does not heed the concerns of the international community as a whole and has not even responded to the sensible propositions we have made to peacefully resolve the crisis, we are forced to respond. All that remains is to make Russia understand that we will never accept the fait accompli that it has just imposed on the ground. But we must also look to the future, with a double call on Russia.

The first is to tell it to stop there. Agents provocateurs are already at work in eastern Ukraine; let them not play the same game as in Crimea; let Russia cease its thinly veiled manoeuvres. It has already succeeded in creating lasting alienation between Ukraine and European countries; to go further wold be most grave. The second call regards the need for Moscow to open a channel of direct negotiations with Kyiv. Russia should make no mistake — Ukraine cannot be replaced with something else, as it seems to hope; no one will decide Ukraine's future except Ukraine itself.

We are already counting the first casualties of this grim misadventure. Yesterday, the Ukrainian Prime Minister announced that the conflict with Russia was now moving from a political phase to a military one. We continue to call on Russia to see reason, listen to the voice of the international community, and not drag the international community into a spiral that will sooner or later spin out of control, or at least escape the restraint of the Ukrainians.

Mr. Sarki (Nigeria): My delegation thanks Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović for their updates on the recent developments in Ukraine. From the outset, we with to reiterate the Deputy Secretary-General's observation that the door for dialogue to resolve the crisis in Ukraine is still open, not closed. We hope that all of the parties involved and concerned will take advantage of that.

This is the eighth time in three weeks that the Security Council has met on the situation in Ukraine. This underscores the seriousness with which the Council views the matter and its commitment to addressing issues related to international peace and security. Nigeria has consistently highlighted and stressed the need for dialogue, especially between the parties directly concerned, and for mediation by the rest of the international community to ensure that the situation in Ukraine is resolved peacefully.

We reaffirm our earlier warning that the world has too many challenges to international peace and security to contemplate adding another layer to existing ones. All peaceful means, including mediation, arbitration and dialogue, must be explored and used to the hilt by the parties concerned. Further escalation of the situation with hurtful rhetoric would only leave to grave consequences, including military confrontation, which the world can ill afford, especially when nuclear-weapon States are involved. The world would therefore not want to see any further deterioration in the situation as this could have grave implications, not just for Ukraine, but for the entire region and beyond. The Deputy Secretary-General's report was clear on that point.

With regard to the human rights situation in Ukraine, we welcome the deployment by Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović of a United Nations monitoring team throughout the country to establish the truth or otherwise or alleged human rights violations. Nigeria once again urges all parties to embrace dialogue and negotiation, and to seek a peaceful resolution to the crisis. We call on all concerned to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine, in line with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Yesterday, a truly historic event took place — the reunification of Russia and Crimea, which our peoples have awaited for six decades. In strict compliance with international law and democratic procedure, without outside interference and through a free referendum, the people of Crimea have fulfilled what is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and a great number of fundamental international legal documents — their right to self-determination. They turned to Russia with a request to welcome Crimea into the Russian Federation. Russia as a sovereign State agreed to the Crimean people's request. A treaty to that end has been signed between the Russian Federation and the Crimean Republic on the accession into the Russian Federation of the Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and the creation within the Russian Federation of two new territorial units.

The results of the referendum were quite clear. More than 82 per cent of voters participated in the voting, more than 96 per cent of whom chose in favour of reunification with Russia. This figure is the expression of the free will of the people of Crimea.

I shall now briefly depart from my text. I was stunned by how the Permanent Representative of Ukraine tried to discredit the referendum by using the arguments of Western propaganda — that those who did not want to vote were visited at home with the police in tow. A few of my Western colleagues may not know this, but my Ukrainian colleagues know very well that this is an old, tried and tested tradition in our elections. If someone cannot vote because they are too ill to come to the polling booth, members of the electoral commission will visit that person at home to afford him or her an opportunity to vote.

But I am going to stick to the topic. I will not dwell on the history of the issue in detail. The President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, spelt it out yesterday in a televised appearance with which I trust all present here are familiar. I shall focus on just a few aspects. Today, out of the 2.2 million inhabitants of the Crimean peninsula, close to 1.5 million are Russian; 350,000 are Ukrainians, most of whom consider Russian to be their mother tongue; and between 290,000 and 300,0000 are Crimean Tatars, a significant proportion of whom, as shown by the referendum, also favour Russia, regardless of what others elsewhere might have suggested in the run-up to the referendum.

A historic injustice has been righted. It resulted from the arbitrary actions of the leader of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the time, Nikita Khrushchev, who, with the stroke of a pen in 1954, in violation of constitutional norms, transferred the Russian region of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was then part of the same State. He did so without informing the population of Crimea and without their consent. No one has showed any regard for the views of the

Crimeans during the break-up of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Over the years, many citizens and community activists in Crimea have repeatedly raised this issue, stating that Crimea is intrinsically Russian land and that Sevastopol is a Russian city. It is only now that the will and freely expressed choice of the Crimean has been fulfiled.

Of course, we have taken note of the reaction of a number of our Western partners who simply cannot rid themselves of the imperial colonial habits of attempting to impose their writ on other peoples and countries. Now they are nervous as their reckless geopolitical gamble in Ukraine has led to such unexpected results. The people of Crimea have spoken and made their choice, as have the people of Russia, and those choices must be accepted and respected by all.

Let me now turn to the alarming situation in Ukraine and the international assistance provided to it to overcome its pronounced internal crisis. The pseudo-friends of Ukraine need to understand once and for all that the cause of the crisis there lies not with Russia but in the irresponsible actions of individual Ukrainian political forces and their foreign mentors. The attempt to drive Ukraine, like other targeted States of the eastern partnership, to make an artificial choice between the European Union and Russia, largely provoked the deep-seated internal political crisis that led to the unconstitutional changes in Kyiv.

However, Western capitals, it would seem, continue to feel no shame about backing people who are not ready to listen or heed the views of the entire Ukrainian people and who are fully dominated by the ultra-radical, nationalist organizations Right Sector and the Freedom Party, which according to the European Parliament, is anti-Russian, anti-Semitic and xenophobic. And yet, it is with them that the European Union is planning to sign the political section of an association agreement in the near future.

In that respect, we are puzzled by Mr. Šimonović's glib, one-sided assessment of the human rights situation in Ukraine. We are especially puzzled by the fact that Mr. Šimonović referred to the Maidan snipers. Not a word was said about the evidence that provocateurs fired both on the representatives of law and order and on the opposition forces to pave the way for the use of force to seize power.

One simply cannot claim that there has been no politically motivated killing or mass torture; no kidnapping of individuals, no attacks on journalists and human rights defenders; no political detentions. One cannot claim that nationalist radicals, like the Taliban in Afghanistan, are not destroying and profaning historical sites, that there are no chilling racist incidents with anti-Russian and anti-Semitic undercurrents, backed or at least passed over in silence by those who have seized power in Kyiv. The Kyiv extremists have offered rewards for killing journalists, the self-proclaimed authorities have shut down foreign television stations, foreign correspondents have been denied all access, and they are even trying to scramble the retransmission of satellite signals.

Two scandalous incidents occurred only yesterday. Two dozen members of Parliament and activists of the Freedom Party pushed their way into the Cabinet, and in front of cameras beat up and took away the General Director of the Ukrainian First National television station, who knows where. Who is in authority in Kyiv? Neo-Nazi slogans are heard, Nazi enforcers and their Bandera-loving storm-troopers are glorified, and calls are sent out for violence against Russian-speaking Ukrainians and Russians in general, with all the signs of ethnic cleansing, and for the armed overthrow of the legal authorities. These must all be clear and obvious to anyone claiming to be objective. Instead, supposedly profound concerns are raised about the human rights situation in Crimea. As a result of the combined efforts of the people and the self-defence forces, law and order has been maintained, and Crimean authorities have guaranteed the rights of all minorities, without exception.

In that respect, we would especially like to draw attention to the fact that, pursuant to the treaty between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Crimea regarding succession to the Federation, there will be three equal State languages in the Republic: Ukrainian, Russian and Crimean Tartar. Crimeans, with the support of the entire Russian people, are doing all in their power to preserve peace and tranquility in Crimea. No provocation will keep them from doing so, not even such incidents as that which occurred a few days ago in Simferopol, where, in Maidan style, sniper fire from an unfinished building across from the Ukrainian military base killed an unarmed self-defence soldier and a Ukrainian national soldier. The attack by Russian forces on a Ukrainian military facility, to which the Permanent Representative referred today, simply did not take place. It was clearly a planned provocation that was immediately seized on by Mr. Yatsenyuk and Mr. Turchynov to call on the Ukrainian military forces in Ukraine to use their weapons — against whom? Against their fellow countrymen?

Russia stands ready to work in close cooperation with all international partners that are genuinely interested in normalizing the situation in Ukraine on the basis of a broad internal Ukrainian dialogue with the participation of all responsible political forces and all regions. Establishing a multilateral mechanism for the settlement of the Ukrainian crisis could be promoted with out partners through our proposal to create an assistance group for Ukraine. We await responses to our constructive initiative.

We will continue to discuss proposals aimed at fulfilling the agreement of 21 February with the objective of restoring order, launching comprehensive constitutional reform in Ukraine, and putting an end to the provocations of the ultra-nationalist and radical forces against the Russian-speaking population and our fellow countrymen in south-eastern and other parts of Ukraine. To that end, observers of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Council of Europe are invited as long as they implement an impartial mandate and mutually agreed modalities for such a deployment in various regions of Ukraine.

Ms. Power (United States of America): I wish to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović for their briefings.

The representative of the Russian Federation began his statement extolling the so-called referendum as embodying democratic procedures and having been conducted without outside interference. Russia is known for its literary greatness, and what the Council just heard from the Russian Ambassador showed more imagination than Tolstoy or Chekhov. Russia has decided, it seems, to rewrite its borders, but it cannot rewrite the facts.

The United States rejects Russia's military intervention and land grab in Crimea. Those actions again violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, Russia's own binding agreements, international law, the expressed will of most members of the Council and the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. Two days ago, President Obama and other world leaders put in place sanctions in response to Russia's blatant disregard for global opinion and the legal rights of Ukraine. We are prepared to take additional steps if Russian aggression or Russian provocations continue.

In this Chamber, when the crisis began, the Russian Federation described its intervention into Crimea as a human rights protection mission. It claimed that the recent change of Government in Ukraine constituted such a danger to ethnic Russians in Crimea that military action was justified. Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović's briefing once again illustrates that the crisis was never about protecting the rights of ethnic Russians and was always about one country's ambition to redraw its own borders.

Indeed, if there was ever a time to be concerned about human rights in Crimea, it is now. Credible reports indicate that cases of harassment have been directed by Russian allies against ethnic Ukrainians and Tatars. The Tatar community, which constitutes 12 per cent of the population, is rightly fearful of again falling victim to deportation or discrimination. The Crimean First Deputy Prime Minister has recently announced that Crimean Tatars will be evicted from some of their land, which he claimed is needed for "infrastructure projects". The body of Reshat Ahmetov, a Crimean Tatar, was discovered Sunday. He had last been seen at a protest in Simferopol on 3 March. Ahmetov's body reportedly showed signs of torture.

Russian troops are reportedly storming apartment buildings housing Ukrainian troops, border guards, veterans and their families, threatening them and demanding their immediate departure. In addition, we are seriously concerned about activists, civil society leaders, media restrictions and journalists in Crimea. Accordingly, the United States supports the rapid deployment of international observers in all parts of Ukraine. We believe it is instructive that the Government of Ukraine has repeatedly welcomed their deployment, and the Russian Federation has not.

Again today in Vienna, Russia was the lone country to block an Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe monitoring mission. There, Russia was dramatically outnumbered. It was the lone dissenting voice out of 57 countries; 56, it seemed, had a different view. Russian officials say that they understand the urgency, but they vote with their feet, relying on their military forces and refusing to allow the deployment of those who could help defuse the crisis and prevent further violence. After hearing my Russian colleague's assault minutes ago on the Assistant Secretary-General's briefing, I see the logic of Russian obstruction.

Objective information is inconvenient to the Russian tale. We call on all parties to support these observer missions, including their access to Crimea.

We want to thank members of the Council for taking a strong stance on Russia's intervention in Ukraine and for making it clear that Russia stands alone in its failed, illogical and mendacious attempt to justify actions that cannot be justified. Five days ago, when the Council accurately described the Crimean separatist referendum as invalid, only a single hand rose in opposition. When the Council declared that the referendum could not form the basis for any alteration of the status of Crimea, only a single hand rose in opposition. Now the referendum has taken place, but the national and international legal status of Crimea has not changed. A thief can steal property, but that does not confer the right of ownership on the thief.

In conclusion, let me just emphasize again that what Russia has done is wrong as a matter of law, wrong as a matter of history, wrong as a matter of policy, and dangerous. What happened in Crimea cannot be recognized as valid. We must stand together denying recognition and imposing consequences for that illegal act. In doing so, we must also be very clear that what happened in Crimea cannot be repeated in other parts of Ukraine.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson, Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović and Permanent Representative of Ukraine Sergeyev for their statements.

The Security Council is meeting at a sensitive moment. The 16 March referendum was held in Crimea and has been judged as unconstitutional and has been seen as undermining the territorial integrity of Ukraine, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations. The circumstances around the vote has led to worry in the international community, which questions its legitimacy. The holding of the referendum has no doubt contributed to the worsening of the situation. Chile would reiterate the need to restore the rule of law and respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine, in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

The death of a Ukrainian soldier in an assault in one of the military barracks in Crimea and the increased tensions in the eastern part of the country reveal an escalation of the crisis that has to be stopped. In that context, we value the briefings of Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights Šimonović.

In truth, we are observing a growing deterioration of the situation. Chile believes that it is necessary to broaden the space for a solution through diplomacy. That is why we endorse the efforts of the Organization and, most especially, the efforts being undertaken by the Secretary-General.

Chile regrets that Mr. Šimonović and observers from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe were not allowed to enter Crimea. We call for the actions of the United Nations not to be impeded, with a view to ensuring timely and truthful information in order to be able to assess the human rights situation on the ground. The situation of ethnic minorities in Crimea is of concern for us, especially that of the Tatar minorities, who have started moving to other areas of Ukraine. The existence of internally displaced persons is the clearest sign of a worsening of the crisis. That fact strengthens the call of the international community to seek a negotiated solution.

It is indispensable that the Council contribute to and generate maximum restraint and moderation among both parties. Accordingly, it makes a new appeal for all sides to avoid unilateral actions that might escalate the crisis still further. Now is the time for constructive participation in an inclusive process that would guarantee the rule of law, human rights, fundamental freedoms and respect for human rights.

Mr. Oh Joon (Republic of Korea): We thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović for their briefings and for the devotion they have shown in their activities taken with respect to Ukraine.

The Republic of Korea is deeply concerned about the recent developments in that country. The Republic of Korea will not recognize the referendum in Crimea nor the annexation of Crimea by Russia. We call on Russia and the Crimean authorities to refrain from further hasty actions. We urge them to immediately enter into meaningful discussions with the Ukrainian Government and the international community, with a view to finding a peaceful political solution.

Implications of any boundary alterations on the existing international order must be fully taken into account. We hope that space exists for a negotiated way forward. In that context, we greatly value the ongoing mediation efforts by the international community, particularly those of the Secretary-General. We look forward to the continued constructive role of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in that regard.

Once again, we reiterate our firm support for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Ukraine. All the relevant international and bilateral agreements, especially the Charter of the United Nations and the Budapest Memorandum of 1994, must be fully observed. It is also vital that the rights of all persons in Ukraine, especially of minorities, be protected. The future of Ukraine should be considered and decided upon based only upon the will and aspirations of all Ukrainians themselves, without any intervention or influence by outside forces.

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, I wish to thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights Ivan Šimonović for their respective briefings. I also thank the Permanent Representative of Ukraine for his participation in today's meeting of the Security Council.

Argentina is following with great concern the unfolding of the situation in Ukraine. The delegation of Argentina once again reiterates the fundamental importance of adhering to the principles that we have all subscribed to as Members of the United Nations.

For Argentina, it is essential to respect the primacy of the principle of the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of all States. Therefore, in speaking in support of the draft resolution that was put to a vote on 15 March, I said that my country had sustained that principle throughout its history, even before the existence of the United Nations, and it will continue steadfastly to do so.

Argentina does not comment on the internal developments in Ukraine that have led to the current institutional crisis in the country because we understand that all countries should refrain from intervening militarily, economically or politically in the internal affairs of other States and should adjust its actions so that they are in strict compliance to international law and the Charter of the United Nations. In that context, we urge that human rights and international humanitarian law be scrupulously observed and that the rights of all minorities — be they ethnic, linguistic, cultural or religious — be upheld.

We are concerned about the past violence and the current violence — and the possibility that it might worsen. We regret that, despite repeated calls, the rhetoric of confrontation has not been abandoned in Ukraine. It is incumbent upon all of us to refrain from encouraging dissent or escalating confrontations that could become a threat to international peace and security. Indeed, it is the most influential actors who should be calling for constructive diplomacy.

Finally, we support the mediation efforts that are being undertaken by various United Nations officials, as well as the good offices of the Secretary-General. We understand that this situation cannot be resolved by unilateral acts. We therefore stress that actions that complicate the situation and that lead us further away from a political and peaceful solution to the crisis must be avoided.

Mr. Gasana (Rwanda): Thank you, Madam President, for convening this meeting on the situation in Ukraine. It shows the seriousness of the situation and the commitment of the Security Council in the quest for a diplomatic solution to the crisis. I also thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General Ivan Šimonović for their respective briefings on the political, security and human rights situation in Ukraine.

Rwanda is still concerned about the prevailing rhetoric in Ukraine and the region and the continued demonstrations and violence in the cities of eastern Ukraine. Something needs to be done, and that begins with a commitment from all parties, with a sense of urgency, to resume dialogue, in order to avoid further escalation of the situation.

We continue to commend the role of the United Nations in that regard. We look forward to the visit of the Secretary-General to the Russian Federation and Ukraine, scheduled for tomorrow, 20 March, and we hope that his visit will help all the parties involved and regional organizations to find a political and diplomatic solution that will benefit Ukrainians and all the peoples of the region. We welcome the deployment of a United Nations human rights monitoring team in Ukraine, and we count on all stakeholders to extend full cooperation to the team. We indeed believe that only an independent body will be able to objectively establish the facts on alleged human rights violations.

Rwanda has been calling for constructive efforts to de-escalate the situation, and we continue to advocate for a political and diplomatic solution to the conflict, with the engagement of the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the European Union and the Russian Federation at the international level, and for inclusive talks at the national level among all Ukrainian parties that ensure equal participation by all communities in the country while protecting minorities. In the meantime, we call on all Ukrainian parties to respect the rule of law and exercise maximum restraint. We urge the regional and international actors to avoid any diplomatic, economic, political or even military move that would further escalate the situation.

In conclusion, let me stress that the Security Council, which is the world's only body in charge of the maintenance of international peace and security, must work towards restoring its own unity, in order to be able to defend the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of a United Nations State Member while addressing the interests of all the countries of the region.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing and Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović for his statement. I also thank Ukraine Ambassador Sergeyev.

As we know, five days ago, the Council sought to adopt a draft resolution on Ukraine reaffirming fundamental principles of international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. The draft resolution was opposed by only one State: Russia. The message of Council members to Russia, reflecting the views of the broader international community, nevertheless, remains clear. It must comply with international law, take active steps to de-escalate the crisis and engage in dialogue towards a peaceful resolution of it.

But the fact is that Russia has steadfastly ignored that message. It has moved to annex Crimea on the basis of a referendum that was manifestly unlawful and illegitimate, not least because it was carried out while Russian forces exercised effective control over Crimea. President Putin's signature of a decree recognizing Crimean independence and of a purported treaty with Crimean leaders and the presidential approval of a draft bill on the annexation of Crimea do not validate the referendum, nor do they provide any legitimate basis for Russia's acquisition of part of the territory of Ukraine. Indeed, Russia's actions are a clear violation of the fundamental principles of international law, which were contained in the draft resolution it vetoed on Saturday: respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, and the illegality of the acquisition of territory by the threat or use of force. Those remain the international community's touchstone, and the international community will not recognize Russia's annexation of Crimea.

Russia has further strengthened its military control of Crimea in recent days, dramatically escalating tensions. Incidents involving the use of armed force, the occupation of military bases and the killing of a Ukrainian soldier and the wounding of another significantly increase the stakes and make a descent into conflict more likely.

Ukrainian Prime Minister Yatsenyuk has sought an immediate meeting of Ministers of Defence of the parties to the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, which provided security guarantees to Ukraine, in order to prevent further escalation of the crisis, and we urge Russia to respond positively to that request. He has sent Ukraine's First Deputy Prime Minister and the Acting Defence Minister to Crimea to de-escalate the crisis. It is crucial that that direct dialogue take place.

The Secretary-General's travel to Moscow and Kyiv over the next few days is clearly welcome, and we urge all parties to engage in constructive dialogue with him.

In pursuing its current course of action, Russia has chosen a path towards isolation. In doing so, it undermines its own standing, credibility and relations with other States and increasingly poses a threat to security and stability in the region. Inevitably, there are consequences for its unlawful action. In addition to measures put in place by others, the Australian Government announced, on 19 March, that it would impose targeted measures against individuals who have been instrumental in the Russian threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. We have not taken those steps lightly and have done so with regret, only after repeatedly urging Russia to de-escalate and engage in diplomatic dialogue to resolve the crisis.

An important first step for Russia will be to recognize the need for and support the deployment of monitors on the ground. We encourage Russia to engage constructively in support of an Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) monitoring mission to Ukraine. Such a mission should be deployed as a matter of priority.

Given the allegations raised by Russia about serious infringement of the human rights of Russian speakers in Crimea and elsewhere in Ukraine, it is obviously important that those allegations continue to be independently assessed, especially as the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities found no evidence of violations or threats to Russian speakers in Crimea during her recent visit. As Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović has just reported to us, the violations he has learned of are neither widespread nor systematic. On the other hand, Crimea's Tatar community clearly feel threatened. Mr. Šimonović has noted there are credible reports that a Tatar activist has been tortured and murdered. There are also reports that Ukrainian civil society activists have been abducted. Those violations must cease. Ongoing human rights monitoring is essential, and we welcome the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights team that is already being done and their continued deployment, but such monitoring must also take place in Crimea.

In conclusion, we are obviously at a critical point for Ukraine and the region and for the integrity of the rules-based international order itself. All Member States have a direct interest in the preservation of that order.

As the Deputy Secretary-General has underlined again today, the crisis must be resolved peacefully through diplomatic means and direct dialogue. Such a resolution must respect Ukraine's unity and territorial integrity. It is up to Russia to commit to finding such a solution. It is not too late for it to turn from the deliberate path of provocation and isolation that it has taken.

Mr. Liu Jieyi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović for their respective briefings. China has been closely following developments in the situation in Ukraine.

The Security Council has repeatedly taken up the question of Ukraine. China has explicitly stated its principled position on the issues concerned. Respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States is China's consistent position. China has taken an fair and impartial approach in addressing the question of Ukraine. We will continue to promote peaceful dialogue and to play a more constructive role in seeking a political solution to the crisis in Ukraine. China has put forward the following proposals in order to address the Ukrainian crisis.

An international coordinating mechanism comprising all parties concerned should be established as soon as possible in order to explore political ways to address the situation in Ukraine. In the meantime, all parties should refrain from taking any action that may further exacerbate tensions. International financial institutions should start to explore various possibilities to help Ukraine maintain its economic and financial stability. In our view, a political solution to the Crimean issue should be found within the framework of law and order.

All parties concerned should exercise restraint and refrain from any action that could cause the situation to further deteriorate. The international community should make constructive efforts to defuse tension.

China supports today's trip by Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon to the countries concerned to conduct mediation. China hopes that the international community will continue to make constructive efforts to defuse tension.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for his briefing. We welcome the Secretary-General's intent to travel to Moscow and Kyiv this week. We hope that his visit will help to persuade President Putin to step back, to de-escalate the siutation, to fulfil Russia's obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, to allow the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and United Nations monitors full access to Crimea, and to engage in dialogue with Ukraine.

We also thank Mr. Šimonović for his briefing. It is inexcusable that he was denied access to Crimea, but we applaud his efforts to gather information from the peninsula via other means. His report on the extent of human rights violations in Crimea is of serious concern. Cases of arbitrary arrest, detention, torture, ill-treatment, disappearances and population displacements directly contradict Russia's claims to the contrary.

We share Mr. Šimonović's concerns about the gross human rights violations that took place under the previous Ukrainian Government. In that context, we welcome the new Ukrainian Government's request for United Nations monitors to investigate those concerns and its commitment to reflect Ukraine's rich linguistic, ethnic and cultural diversity. We urge the rapid deployment of the United Nations monitors across the country.

Last Saturday, 14 Council members underlined their commitment to Ukraine's unity and territorial integrity (see S/PV.7138). Russia was urged to distance itself from the referendum set to take place the next day in Crimea. Our aim was to avoid further escalation and to ask Russia to heed the views of the international community.

Russia has rejected that message. It rejected it on Saturday by vetoing a draft resolution that carried the overwhelming support of the Council. Yesterday, following the referendum, it underlined its disregard for our appeals for calm and for de-escalation by announcing new laws to incorporate Crimea into the Russian Federation. The Permanent Representative of Russia spoke about that process being in compliance with international law, without outside interference and through a democratic process. It is hard to know which of those three assertions is the biggest lie.

Sunday's referendum was a mockery of democratic practice. It was illegal under the Ukrainian Constitution, arranged at 10 days' notice, met none of the OSCE standards for democratic elections, was held under Russian military occupation and gave the people of Crimea no option to vote for the status quo. Neither the referendum nor the succession of increasingly desperate, contradictory and inconsistent legal arguments put forward by Russia can conceal the stark reality of that country's actions. Russia has annexed part of the sovereign territory of an independent State Member of the United Nations through the use of military force.

Russia claims not to be bound by any of its previous obligations and commitments in respect of Ukraine, including the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, on the grounds that it does not regard the new Government in Ukraine as legitimate. However, treaties and international agreements are between States, not Governments. A change in Government in Kyiv does not absolve Russia from its international obligations and commitments. We are witnessing the illegal behaviour of a large country bullying its neighbours, disregarding international norms and unilaterally adjusting internationally recognized borders to its own advantage.

Yesterday, in his speech to the Federation Council, President Putin said: "In the hearts and conscience of the people, Crimea has always been, and remains, an inalienable part of Russia". He went on to add that, because Crimea was a strategic territory, it needed to be under the strong and stable sovereignty of Russia. Now, at last, after weeks of denial, Russia's real motives for its military adventurism have been admitted. There are plenty of lessons from history about where that kind of extraordinary logic leads. One only has to think back to the 1930s to recognize the dangers of a complacent international response when such behaviour occurs.

The United Nations system and the framework of international norms that it embodies were the response of our forefathers to a global conflict that resulted from lawless aggression. The United Nations was designed to provide security to us all by preventing the subjugation of any State. We all therefore have an interest in upholding the international framework and norms that the United Nations represents. Russian actions throw into doubt the credibility of that international order. That is why they should be clearly condemned and why Russia must now face further consequences for its actions.

Russia cannot be granted the impunity to disregard international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Even at this late stage, Russia has the option to change course, to heed the message of the international community and to engage in dialogue with Ukraine. Last week, in the Council, we all heard the Ukrainian Prime Minister offer to open up such a dialogue with Russia (see S/PV.7134). Yet, so far, even that basic step has been rejected.

The situation in Ukraine and the region is serious. Yesterday, another threshold was passed when a Ukrainian serviceman was killed during the storming of a Ukrainian military compound in Crimea by forces aligned with Russia. There are credible reports of Russian-inspired provocations across eastern and southern Ukraine. We praise the continuing and remarkable restraint of the Ukrainian military. However, such actions only underline how close we are to a further dramatic escalation.

The issue extends far beyond Ukraine's imperilled borders. The issue before us is about respect for bilateral and international treaties. It is about upholding the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Those are the frameworks on which we all rely and that Russia is challenging. We have a collective responsibility to defend everything that we have worked so hard to build over the past 70 years.

Ms. Murmokaitė (Lithuania): I, too, would like to thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson and Assistant Secretary-General Šimonović for their briefings and our colleague from Ukraine for his statement.

Last Sunday, a hastily crafted illegal referendum took place in Ukraine's Crimea — a referendum held in a region cut off from its mainland and the rest of the world by another country's armed forces and under a heavy barrage of aggressive anti-Ukrainian propaganda.

Representatives of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe and key United Nations national and regional organizations with outstanding experience in human rights monitoring and the organization and observation of elections were all prevented from entering Crimea. The plebiscite was organized in a record short period of time, probably a first in the practice of referendums, without nationwide preparations or consultations. Not a single credible international observer was present to verify and ascertain that this hurried referendum was free and fair. Those facts alone are sufficient to raise alarms about the quality of the referendum and its fraudulence.

At the same time, notably while representatives of major international organizations, monitors and observers were prevented from entering Crimea, more than 100 so-called "independent referendum observers", as our French colleague has stated, who were well-established hard-line nationalists, Nazi sympathizers, deniers of the Holocaust, anti-semites, deniers of the massacre of Srebrenica and Islamophobes — hardly a company to keep for those who claim to protect Europe, Ukraine and Crimea from fascism — were able to observe and to ascertain that allegedly the referendum was fine and fair.

The indigenous Tatar population, for whom Crimea is the only place on Earth they can call home and whose massive deportation by Stalin in cattle cars is still very much alive in their collective memory, called to boycott the election as contrary to their desire to be an integral part of Ukraine. How about their right to self-determination?

The so-called referendum is nothing but an undisguised land grab and a blatant violation by Russia of the Charter of the United Nations, international law, as well as bilateral and multilateral agreements and commitments. A country which should have been a guarantor of Ukraine's sovereignty, as per the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, breached its legal responsibility towards Ukraine to protect its sovereignty and territorial integrity in exchange for its renunciation of nuclear weapons. How does that bode for the non-proliferation regime?

Sunday's referendum is nothing else but a fraudulent sham whose sole purpose was to rubber-stamp the illegal annexation of a part of Ukraine. As such, it cannot be recognized by the international community. Lithuania once again calls on all States to reject that act, not to recognize the illegal joining of a part of the territory of sovereign Ukraine to the Russian Federation and to reaffirm their support for the principles of the United Nations Charter and the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

How deeply ironic is the fact that, carried out under the false pretext of protecting human and minority rights, the aggression against Crimea is carried out by pro-Russian militants with Moscow's support, causing serious and repeated human rights violations against the Crimean population through incitement against Ukrainians, extreme censorship, shutting down media outlets and press hubs, cases of arbitrary arrest, detention and enforced disappearances, routine attacks against journalists, vandalism, beatings and other ill-treatment?

Furthermore, the outcome of the referendum and the rushed admittance of Crimea into the Russian fold will further infringe upon the rights of large numbers of Crimea's inhabitants, who will be forced to make heart-rending choices regarding their loyalty to the Ukrainian State and their citizenship, with serious consequences for their families, their property rights and their future.

One country appropriating at will a part of a neighbouring country is a profoundly disturbing signal to everyone that, once again, territories are up for grabs and that the international norms guaranteeing the sovereignty, territorial integrity and the inviolability of States can be rewritten by force. Who will be next?

Mr. Omaish (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): Jordan would like to express its concerns following the events of the crisis in Ukraine, especially in Crimea, given the fact that efforts undertaken to achieve a peaceful solution have unfortunately not yet been successful. We would like to reiterate the need to protect the sovereignty of Ukraine, its territorial integrity and its political independence.

All territories and regions of Ukraine, including Crimea, fall under Ukrainian sovereignty. That fact is recognized by the international community and established by international law and, of course, the Charter of the United Nations, which is further complemented by relevant international treaties, such as the Budapest Memorandum of 1994 and the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership between Ukraine and the Russian Federation of 1997.

We wish to reaffirm the fact that the instrument that governs all regions and parts of Ukraine's territory is the Constitution, which guarantees its territorial integrity and unity throughout all regions and parts of the country. That is why it is simply unacceptable to split off a part of its territory and have another country annex it. The international community should spare no effort to tackle the crisis and to encourage the parties to reach a solution that would protect their legitimate interests and rights, which would result, of course, in a return of Crimea to Ukrainian control.

There is also a need to establish the necessary guarantees to protect the interests of the various sides. If ever an agreement were to be concluded to put an end to the crisis, it should include guarantees of minorities' rights in Ukraine. We urge the United Nations to use its good offices to reconcile the positions of the two parties and to come up with a mechanism that would enable us to initiate dialogue and make progress.

Clearly, the time has come to set up an international contact group to achieve that objective, to work with all parties on the ground and to cooperate with the various monitoring and observation groups, which could be deployed to verify the situation throughout all regions in Ukraine, including Crimea. The various parties to the crisis should refrain from actions that would lead to escalation. They should give pride of place to reconciliation, common sense and logic, and work with international organizations within the framework of the existing forums. Such an effort would spare the world from the negative consequences of the crisis and its impact on international peace and security.

Mr. Cherif (Chad) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank Mr. Eliasson and Mr. Šimonović for their briefings. I would also like to thank the Permanent Representative of Ukraine for his statement.

Chad is alarmed by what is taking place in Ukraine, including in Crimea. We note with a great deal of concern that, despite the repeated calls by the international community, in particular the Security Council, the undermining of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine continues.

We reaffirm once again that we are committed to the unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and we urge all parties to comply with the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including Article 2. We ask all the relevant parties to give pride of place to a peaceful settlement. We support the good offices of the Secretary-General aimed at forging direct dialogue between the two parties to achieve a political solution.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Luxembourg.

I thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson and Mr. Ivan Šimonović, Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, for their briefings. I also thank the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations, Ambassador Yuriy Sergeyev, for his statement.

It cannot be emphasized enough — the referendum held on 16 March in the Crimea violated the Constitution of Ukraine, which provides that the territory of Ukraine is indivisible and inviolable. In addition, the election was held in conditions that forfeited all legitimacy. Crimea was occupied and cut off from the rest of Ukraine, journalists and members of civil society were intimidated, and media freedom was severely hampered. Representatives of the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) who had been invited by the Ukrainian Government were denied access to the Crimea.

The international community in no way recognizes the result of this illegal and unconstitutional referendum. Similarly, the international community does not recognize any measure to integrate the Ukrainian Autonomous Republic of Crimea within the Russian Federation via the referendum. We welcome the very broad convergence of views on this issue in the Security Council.

Russia's actions on Ukrainian territory over the past three weeks flagrantly violate international law, particularly the Charter of the United Nations and the Helsinki Final Act. They contradict the commitments made by Russia regarding Ukraine in the framework of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum and the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership signed in 1997 between Russia and Ukraine.

Luxembourg is deeply concerned about the rising tensions in Crimea caused by the illegal presence of armed Russian forces outside their authorized area. It is urgently necessary to defuse the crisis through military de-escalation, starting with the immediate withdrawal of Russian forces to their pre-crisis permanent areas of deployment. We welcome the calm and restraint shown by the Ukrainian authorities to date in the face of the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their country. However, we consider the death of a Ukrainian officer killed yesterday by bullets during the attack on a military base in Simferopol of greatest concern. Today, there are reports of attacks on Ukrainian armed forces bases, including the headquarters of the Ukrainian navy in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. In the present context, every incident could become the spark that ignites the fire.

To address the crisis, we believe that the United Nations has a role to play in close cooperation with the OSCE, the Council of Europe and other organizations. We regret that it was not possible for the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights to visit Crimea. Nevertheless, Mr. Šimonović's briefing, based on the evidence he collected, tends to confirm the observation made two weeks ago by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. The main reason given by the Russia to legitimize its actions — threats to the rights of Russian speakers and communities in Crimea — have turned out to be unfounded. It was not the actions of the Government in Kyiv or the Ukrainian authorities but Russia's military escalation that fostered a climate of impunity and an increase in human rights violations in Crimea. The situation threatens seriously to disrupt the balance between the various communities that have coexisted peacefully until now in Crimea.

We welcome the efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to quickly deploy observers, under the "Rights up front" action plan of the Secretary-General, to monitor the human rights situation of throughout Ukrainian territory. The observers can establish the facts and report objectively in order to halt the spread of unfounded allegations geared to exacerbate tensions. We hope that the team of observers will soon be fully operational and that it will also go to Crimea and eastern Ukraine. In the same vein, we hope that the presence of the international community throughout Ukraine will be reinforced as soon as possible by the establishment of a special OSCE observer mission. Its implementation should be delayed no further.

In general, we encourage the United Nations to pursue its good offices in the crisis between Ukraine and Russia. In that respect, we applaud the visit planned by the Secretary-General to Moscow and Kyiv in the next few days. Even if they have not yet borne fruit, diplomatic efforts must continue intensively to achieve a solution that respects the political independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

The representative of the Russian Federation has asked to make a further statement.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): During the course of our discussions, a number of my colleagues have given themselves poetic license. I am especially forced to return to the statement made by the representative of the United States. Ms. Powers started with a reference to Tolstoy and Chekhov and finished by lowering herself to the level of the tabloid press. It is simply unacceptable to listen to such insults addressed to our country. If the delegation of the United States of America expects our cooperation in the Security Council on other issues, Ms. Powers must understand that quite clearly.

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of Ukraine has asked to make a further statement. I give him the floor.

Mr. Sergeyev (Ukraine): I would like to thank you personally, Madam President, for convening this meeting. I would like to thank all the members of the Council for inviting me to take part in it. I am grateful to the Deputy Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General for their briefings. I would like to extend my gratitude to all who, in their statements, expressed support for the territorial integrity of my country and raised strong objections concerning the illegitimacy of the referendum in Crimea. I will now say a few words in Russian, as is becoming customary.

(*spoke in Russian*)

I should like to comment on a few elements of the statement of my colleague from the Russian Federation. It is very complicated and to a large extent unpleasant to make comments regarding some of the statements made by my Russian colleague. It is very difficult to comment on what is blatantly false because it puts one in a position of having justify oneself.

Regarding the freedom of expression and access to information in Ukraine, does Mr. Churkin know the difference between freedom of expression and access to information in Ukraine and in Russia? All the webcasts of the Security Council are broadcast in Ukraine on all channels, without editing. Not everything that was heard here today will sound pleasant to the ears of Ukrainians. There were a great many recommendations made here today that contain elements critical of Ukraine, but we are ready to listen to all of that.

The only things that are heard in the Russian media are Russian statements. Yesterday, I met with a women's non-governmental organization that participated in the Women's Forum at the United Nations. One of the women was from Odessa, another from Donetsk and the third was from Chernihiv. All were Russian speakers. They turned to me and asked: "How can the whole world, watching on television, be told such lies as are heard in many of the statements made by representatives of the Russian Federation?" How could I answer them?

The means justify the ends? That is probably the only answer.

I have two comments that it simply behoves me to make. My Russian colleague characterized as blasphemy the decision of the Ukrainian authorities yesterday to allow our military in Crimea to use weapons in self-defence, following the death of their fellow soldier. Today, we have heard that it is blasphemy because they are raising their weapons against their fellow countrymen. This is odd. The feeling one is left with is that it is Ukraine that has launched an attack by bringing its forces in, as opposed to the truth, which is that Russia three weeks ago deployed its forces throughout the sovereign territory of Ukraine — and this at the beginning of the Orthodox Easter, at the time when believers were to gather. I believe that there is an excess of cynicism and untruth here.

(*spoke in English*)

Ukraine keeps saying that we are ready for dialogue. We started with a request to our Russian colleagues to hold consultations under the bilateral agreement. We invited all guarantors under the Budapest Memorandum to convene a meeting as provided for by that document. The Russian Federation refused. We are ready for further dialogue, and we acknowledge the recent proposal made by the Russian Federation. But what is disappointing is that these are not proposals; they are ultimatums and demands as to how Ukraine should build its future. We do not like these ultimatums because they are open interference in our domestic affairs. We would like to have dialogue.

We applaud the efforts of the Secretary-General over recent weeks and we expect that his meetings in Moscow in Kyiv will lead to some positive developments. I thank my colleagues in the Chamber for their support.

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of the Russian Federation has asked to take the floor to make an additional statement.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I do not want to exchange polemics with my Ukrainian colleagues and I do not think there is going to be a lengthy discussion, but there are two comments that I wish to make.

What is cynicism? Cynicism is attempting to provoke a conflict by shooting both at one's own side and the other side. Today, a number of my colleagues referred to an alleged attack on a Ukrainian base. I can tell the Council again that there has been no attack on any base. There were not even any Russian soldiers present. Those who were present were unarmed members of the self-defence forces, wearing only bullet-proof jackets, and a sniper posted on a nearby building shot, killed and injured one person on each side. Immediately, the leaders in Kyiv come out with a statement saying that there is now a need to fire on Russian soldiers. Now that is real cynicism.

Cynicism is what we saw in the Maidan, where there was an attempt to provoke the violent overthrow of the authorities by shooting at all sides and kill as many protestors as possible, as Mr. Šimonović said today. A professional fired on the crowds, and everyone saw where the shots came from. One well-equipped and well-trained sniper came from the headquarters of the so-called Maidan commandant. That is cynicism.

Finally, let me turn to the so-called ultimatum. I do not know why our Ukrainian colleagues refer to this as an ultimatum. Our Western partners have started to consider how to extricate themselves from the crisis in Ukraine and to come up with their own recipes to do so. We in response provided them with our vision of how we could extricate ourselves from the crisis in Ukraine to ensure that all regions feel at rest and secure. The very core of our proposal is entirely in keeping with the agreement of 21 February. There needs to be a constitutional process whereby all regions would feel that their rights were being defended within the framework of the Ukrainian State. That is not an ultimatum to Kyiv, but something we have discussed with our partners. In my statement today, I said that we stand ready to continue such dialogue.

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of France has asked to take the floor to make an additional statement.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I believe that we cannot talk nonsense here and that we cannot let the representative of the Russian Federation lecture us to the effect that Russia has made proposals intended to settle the conflict. In reality, Russia's proposals are simple. What is mine is mine — that is to say, Crimea — and we can negotiate on what is yours — that is to say, Ukrainian sovereignty. That is the Russian proposal. The Russian keep repeating that they are ready to talk about whatever is left of Ukraine, but Crimea is over. We say no; let us be clear. On such bases, we cannot have a dialogue founded on international legal order. We did not reject the Russian proposal. Quite simply, we rejected any proposal that boils down to forcing us to accept the annexation of Crimea. It is simple. We are ready to negotiate on the basis of international law. International law means the territorial integrity of Ukraine.

The President (*spoke in French*): The representative of the Russian Federation has asked to take the floor to make an additional statement.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I have a feeling that there is something in our proposal that our French colleague does not like. That is the impression I am left with. But we did not submit it as a draft resolution of the Security Council. It was discussed by Secretary of State Kerry and Minister Lavrov in great detail. They tabled their documents; we tabled ours. What is unusual about any of this? I do not see anything unusual in all of this, and if there is something that he does not like, let us sit down and discuss the specific points that you do not like. That is standard diplomatic process.

The President (*spoke in French*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

United Nations

S/PV.7145

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7145th meeting

Thursday, 20 March 2014, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Maes	(Luxembourg)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Oyarzábal
	Australia	Ms. King
	Chad	Mr. Mangaral
	Chile	Mr. Errázuriz
	China	Mr. Zhao Yong
	France	Mr. Bertoux
	Jordan	Mr. Omaish
	Lithuania	Ms. Murmokaitė
	Nigeria	Mr. Sarki
	Republic of Korea	Ms. Paik Ji-ah
	Russian Federation	Mr. Iliichev
	Rwanda	Mr. Manzi
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Tatham
	United States of America	Mr. DeLaurentis

Agenda

The situation in Liberia

Twenty-seventh progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Liberia (S/2014/123)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Accessible document

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Liberia

Twenty-seventh progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Liberia (S/2014/123)

The President (*spoke in French*): Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite Ms. Karin Landgren, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Mission in Liberia, to participate in this meeting.

Under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite His Excellency Mr. Staffan Tillander, Chair of the Liberian country configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission and representative of Sweden, to participate in this meeting.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I wish to draw the attention of Council members to document S/2014/123, which contains the twenty-seventh progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Liberia.

I now give the floor to Ms. Landgren.

Ms. Landgren: I thank you, Sir, for this opportunity to update and complement the report before the Council on the situation in Liberia (S/2014/123).

The political and security environment remains relatively stable. Progress continues in a number of areas, but as Liberia enters its second post-conflict decade, it also continues to face great challenges to institutionalizing reforms in critical sectors and building capacity for effective governance. These are complex and daunting processes, as even before the war Liberia had few well-functioning meritocratic institutions and effective accountability mechanisms. Seizing this window to get the fundamentals right will be critical to consolidating Liberia's hard-won peace and to charting the country's inclusive development.

Voices across a wide spectrum continued to express dissatisfaction with national authorities and policies. Motorcycle taxi unions, business owners and civil society have held demonstrations; health workers have gone on strike twice since December; and all operations at Liberia's main university were interrupted for three months due to student protests and violence. Eleven anti-government protestors were charged with sedition in October, bringing criticism that the Government was using the law in an instrumental manner to dampen opposition and dissent. Tensions between large concessions and communities continued.

Legislative elections for half of the Senate's 30 seats are scheduled for October. Approaching the end of the voter roll update, the National Elections Commission has registered some 60,000 people, far short of its initial goal of 400,000 — a goal later cut by half. About one-third of registrants are women. This month, the Senate approved an amendment to the election law that encourages parties to include at least 30 per cent women in their governing structures and candidate lists. Although this falls short of an obligation and still requires the concurrence of the House of Representatives, the measure represents a step forward in the public debate over women's political representation.

Turning now to Liberia's reform processes, since January the Constitution Review Committee has had more structured and sustained engagement with the legislature. The United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) continues to advocate for broader agreement among major stakeholders, including the executive, on the scope and timeline of constitutional reform. The Committee's civic education activities faced severe delays, causing their public consultations to be conducted largely in parallel with civic education. A national conference to validate constitutional amendment proposals ahead of their submission to the President is planned for April. Should this also be delayed, the mid-2014 target for submitting these proposals may be difficult to meet. On the other hand, pushing the pace in order to meet these timelines could risk compromising the quality of public consultations and miss the opportunity to incorporate the public's views.

The Government also took further steps towards implementing its decentralization policy. Efforts towards deconcentrating 12 ministries and agencies continued, with greatest progress in critical service areas, such as health and education, where both ministries have established county boards and devolved some monetary resources and decision-making. The Governance Commission is attentive to UNMIL and donor partner concerns about weak coordination in the overall deconcentration process. A local Government act, calling for the election of local officials and other critical measures for effective decentralization, has been drafted and is now with the President, although the current version would require constitutional amendment for its implementation.

These reforms are fundamental for the country's future, more inclusive, character, which also links them to national reconciliation. With the National Reconciliation Road Map giving structure to the process, and with the Peacebuilding Fund having allocated $15 million to reconciliation initiatives, some progress has been made. The Palava Hut initiative was launched in October, but discussions around methodology continue, and actual implementation has not yet begun. A national history project and a review of national symbols have both been launched, although their implementation has been slow. The Government's contribution to the implementation of the Road Map has been limited, with most successes being in those areas receiving funds from the international community.

Let me turn now to two broad areas central to continued stability: issues of accountability and transparency, and issues of justice and security.

There have been some recent efforts to secure greater public accountability. The Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission has begun investigating bribery allegations made against a former legislator and an official of the National Oil Company of Liberia. Also, last month six former senior officials of the Forestry Development Authority were indicted on charges of economic sabotage and criminal conspiracy related to the fraudulent issuance of timber private use permits for commercial logging on 2.5 million hectares of land. The Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy also completed a draft mine and mineral act, calling for benefits-sharing with communities. The Liberia Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative has done important work in conducting post-contract award process audits and strengthening the sanctions regime for non-compliant companies and the Government. These developments are positive, and I cannot overstate the importance of greater accountability, transparency and consultation with communities in Liberia's valuable natural-resource sector.

Since last month, the Armed Forces of Liberia have been led by a Liberian for the first time since the war. There was palpable jubilation in the streets and on the airwaves at the appointment of Brigadier General Daniel D. Ziankhan. As the Council is well aware, progress in Liberia's security sector is critical to UNMIL's steady military drawdown. The Liberia National Police (LNP), bearing the greatest burden of the security transition, has been hard pressed to cope. Complicated budgetary procedures and its own weak capacity for financial management have limited the ability of the police to administer even small allocations. I want to highlight some important commitments the Government made at the start of this year that are expected to give a boost to the security sector.

The first is the personal engagement of the Minister of Finance. In February, the Minister took steps to ease the complicated requirements for disbursement of transition-related funds to the police, immigration service and other agencies. This will alleviate the paralysis at the police training academy, which has over 1,000 recruits waiting to start training. These funds will also help to resource urgent operational requirements related to the security transition. UNMIL applauds the Minister's continued involvement, which has also addressed critical needs at the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

The second is the President's own commitment to activating more training resources and the better use of facilities. With partners, the United Nations has supported the fast-tracking of management training for officers of the LNP and the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization at the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration. Together with the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, UNMIL is also supporting the conversion of former UNMIL facilities in Foya, Lofa county, into a new immigration training centre. However, more needs to be done to operationalize the LNP regional training centre in Harper, and to make better use of training facilities at the justice and security hub in Gbarnga. The President has also committed to achieving a better balance in the 2014-2015 national budget between infrastructure and national security, and to streamlining procedures for financing recurrent costs.

There has been progress in a number of areas within the security sector following a series of reviews conducted last year. Most notable has been the baseline assessment of the Liberia National Police, which has informed a new LNP strategic plan and a joint LNP-United Nations development framework that outlines specific and targeted interventions to fill gaps, while including a robust monitoring and evaluation system.

The framework is expected to be signed by the LNP and UNMIL next week. A similar joint baseline assessment of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization will be completed this year. Following a security sector reform retreat in September, marked by frank discussion, the National Security Council is overseeing preparation of a new national security strategy. UNMIL will continue to offer support through this process.

In June, UNMIL will complete the second phase of its three-phase military drawdown endorsed by the Council. As I speak, United Nations troops are withdrawing from counties along the Sierra Leone border to cover other areas, and another battalion is being repatriated. At the conclusion of these movements, half of Liberia's counties will be left without a fixed United Nations military presence, with the remaining battalions configured to provide coverage in Monrovia and along the Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea borders, which are also the country's most populated areas.

The joint transition planning process is an example of exceptional collaboration between UNMIL and the Government. The implementation of the first phase highlighted deep institutional weaknesses and stringent resource constraints. National institutions have begun taking on security functions in areas no longer covered by UNMIL, such as static guard duties at important locations, including at the Monrovia Freeport and the Central Bank. To achieve this, however, they have spread existing capacity more thinly, and at times diverted resources away from priority areas.

When planning began for this security transition, the impending withdrawal of United Nations forces from any county prompted public and Government anxiety. The public discourse has shifted now to acknowledging that UNMIL will not be staying forever. The coming phases will need careful management. The detailed joint planning to date, Government and UNMIL dialogue with communities, and the calibrated and gradual phasing of the drawdown have been instrumental in allaying concerns, while making clear the goals to be reached by Liberia's security institutions.

An effective security sector needs to work with a functioning criminal justice system that inspires public trust, which remains extremely low in Liberia. Some 75 per cent of the prison population is in pre-trial detention, creating insecurity in overcrowded prisons, while failure effectively to prosecute even serious crimes promotes a culture of impunity. Many courts in Liberia still fail to sit, and those that do address a minute fraction of pending cases, with UNMIL monitoring showing that, on average, only 8 per cent of cases are fully tried. The first justice and security hub is operational and has brought services to the counties it covers. Based on lessons learned, services are now slowly being rolled out in the second and third hubs. Once hubs are established, it is the Government's obligation to sustain their functioning.

Measures have also been taken to implement the recommendations of last year's management and accountability review of the police, judiciary and prosecution, which were validated in November. Among these is the drafting of a police act, which is expected to address clear and merit-based recruitment and promotion procedures within the police and issues of police oversight. However, the disbarring of the Minister of Justice for six months by the Supreme Court in January has created additional challenges to gaining momentum in justice and security sector reforms.

Meanwhile, there are encouraging parallel developments that can also help to reduce conflict. Last week I visited one of Liberia's six land coordination centres, in Harper, Maryland county, and met with two claimants who had been locked in decades of dispute over their lands. The centre is working to resolve this and to demarcate the properties. The United Nations Peacebuilding Fund-supported alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, such as the land coordination centres, using trained staff, will remain important and should receive significant international support for the years to come. As the local head of the land coordination centre explained to me, its mediation role is free, also making it more attractive to users than the justice system.

Since I last addressed this body (see S/PV.7029), there has been steady progress towards durable solutions for those who sought refuge in Liberia in connection with the Ivorian post-election crisis. Voluntary repatriations surpassed targets in 2013, and in January and February of this year over 5,300 refugees returned to Côte d'Ivoire, with the assistance of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). However, in the early morning hours of 17 February, the Government of Liberia, a party to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, forcibly returned a group of Ivorians, including 14 refugees, to Côte D'Ivoire, in breach of international law, in what appears to have been a closely coordinated operation with the Ivorian Government. Six of the refugees have since been returned to Liberia. The Government has not been forthcoming with UNMIL as to the nature of the operation.

Over 46,000 Ivorian refugees remain in Liberia, and I am concerned that recent events, including an attack in Côte d'Ivoire near the border on 23 February, may have a chilling effect on returns. I am encouraged that the two Governments, with UNHCR, plan to resume the work of the Tripartite Commission on Humanitarian and Refugee Issues at the ministerial-level meeting this month. Despite a long period of calm, the situation remains fragile along the Liberia/Côte d'Ivoire border. Aside from their apparent security cooperation, engagement between the two Governments on concrete measures to stabilize the border has continued to be overshadowed by other priorities, or hampered by resource constraints.

With the closure of our sister mission in Sierra Leone this month, we reflect on the stability that has returned to West Africa and to Liberia's neighbours. As we look ahead, we are conscious of regional and national watershed events to come: presidential elections in 2015 in Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire, and in 2017 in Liberia. Much is at stake here, and stability and confidence will need to be maintained. We are equally conscious of the enormous pressures on United Nations peacekeeping globally, with resources needed in several countries simply to avert immediate bloodshed. UNMIL is currently engaged in a comparative analysis with the United Nations country team, on which we expect to report at our next meeting. But the Council should be under no illusion that the bulk of UNMIL work can be assumed by anyone other than the Government of Liberia itself. Continuing to manage an appropriate exit strategy from Liberia, in whose stability the international community has invested so much, will remain a delicate challenge for UNMIL and for the Council.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Ms. Landgren for her briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Tillander.

Mr. Tillander: Let me first express my appreciation to the presidency of the Security Council for its invitation to me to give the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) perspectives on key peacebuilding challenges facing Liberia.

I will focus my remarks today, on justice and security, national reconciliation, and land tenure and natural resources, and I will also discuss mobilization of support and resources and the need to accelerate capacity-building in view of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) transition.

The PBC country configuration for Liberia — with its approximately 40 Member States — offers support based on the statement of mutual commitments, and in close collaboration with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and UNMIL. As we are now in the process of finalizing the third review of the statement, we can conclude that while some progress has been made on building capacity in justice and security, and while some aspects of national reconciliation have moved forward, many commitments still remain unfulfilled.

If Liberia is to implement its own plans and stated policy goals, there is a need for sustained Government attention and focus on key peacebuilding challenges. While the international community can certainly play an important supportive role, there is no substitute for Liberian ownership, political will and leadership. The good offices of the United Nations and partners can support continued Liberian attention to peacebuilding priorities through dialogue and the marshaling of support and resources.

One area of particular concern is justice and the rule of law. Progress here has been very slow, as is evident not only in police training, but also in the slow pace of reform of the judiciary, corrections and other areas. As the UNMIL drawdown continues, it is necessary for Liberian institutions to increase their capacity to provide satisfactory standards of justice, security and other related services across the country. What can then be done to accelerate progress?

One example was offered during my most recent visit as the Minister of Finance, in connection with the discussion on the statement of mutual commitments, initiated a series of meetings with all involved, aimed at ensuring that police training will get the decisions, commitments and budget necessary to move ahead. This high-level coordinated engagement needs to continue, and implementation must follow. Sustained attention is necessary. If that happens, police training may improve. There is no reason why that should not be possible, but the experience of the past 18 months has not been encouraging in this regard. Hopefully, we should now see a change.

The sustainability of progress is a concern, as is the need to ensure a balanced strengthening of the entire rule-of-law chain. As I observed during my recent visit to Liberia, relations between the State and citizens are fragile and the sense of mutual trust is weak. To improve public trust, political and judicial services must focus on quality as well as quantity, and ensure stronger public oversight. A comprehensive and coordinated approach is necessary, effectively linking short-term measures to long-term development plans. UNMIL and the United Nations country team should continue to work hand in hand and increase their integration. For the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), no other task is more important than this, and its contribution must be effective, efficient and timely. That is especially true in view of the UNMIL drawdown and the need to coordinate a comprehensive and integrated approach to rule of law.

The regional justice and security hubs aim to facilitate decentralization and better access to justice for all levels of society in every region of the country. The first hub in Gbarnga is now providing services to the three counties. Its impact can be felt to varying degrees throughout the counties concerned and is being assessed and evaluated to guide future efforts. In particular, the quicker deployment of police officers to emergency situations in the hub counties has prevented conflicts from escalating. One major challenge has been public outreach to inform people in all three hub counties about the services that the hub is offering. Unfortunately, as surveys have shown, the hub is known mostly to people living in the Gbarnga region.

Based on lessons learned from the first hub, including the public outreach component, services are beginning to be delivered from the second and third hubs, but this time the focus has been on services rather than infrastructure for quicker roll-out. These are positive developments, in the right direction, although they are not fast enough, especially in view of the UNMIL drawdown.

Several bilateral partners are already involved in justice and security. Some, including the European Union, are in the process of stepping up support and considering substantial levels and with long-term commitment. If this is to be possible and have the intended effects, Government commitment must be strong and evident through sufficient budget allocations, commitment to reform, and political will. Bilateral donors would be more eager to engage when linked to clear Government leadership and strategy.

On national reconciliation, and as stated by Special Representative of the Secretary-General Landgren, the Government of Liberia launched the Palava Hut programme, the national history project and the national symbols project. Discussion on South-South cooperation may lead to inspiring exchanges of experiences from other countries, but in most of those areas implementation remains very slow. The Liberian Government must ensure that the institutions responsible for the different areas have the determination, mandate and resources necessary, and that implementation is accelerated within the coordinated framework of the road map for reconciliation. There is a need for action to deal with the past, truth-telling, atonement and reconciliation, to ensure women's participation, and to follow up the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) has provided considerable support already, and it is encouraging that the Government has stated that it will commit additional resources to implementation. That will be absolutely essential. There is also a need for a costed and coordinated implementation plan. The PBC is prepared to support Government-led efforts to marshal support and resources for national reconciliation.

Land and natural resources are essential to peacebuilding efforts. If managed correctly, they may contribute to peace consolidation and sustainable economic growth. During my last visit, I had the opportunity to see some of the progress made in land-dispute resolution, supported by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, the World Bank and the United States. The land law and the establishment of a land agency could become important tools for further progress in dealing with conflicting claims to land by communities, concessions and individuals. This is also one of the issues raised in the letter I received from the Chair of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1521 (2003), and one of several issues I raised with the President and Ministers during my recent visit. Government representatives acknowledged that more is needed to deal with the challenges and to ensure a sustainable management of land and natural resources. The World Bank and UNDP are now stepping up efforts and support in this area, including with support from the PBF and the encouragement of the PBC.

In line with its stated intention to fight corruption, the Government of Liberia has recently taken actions to take perpetrators to court. This is welcome, but more needs to be done to ensure that corruption does not go unpunished. Oversight mechanisms need to be strengthened across all public institutions. The judiciary needs to be strengthened, and the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission should be given the means and tools to ensure accountability, in complementarity with the criminal justice system.

Civil society plays an important role in channeling the views of groups, individuals and local communities, thereby supporting a free flow of information that will help decision-makers in the private and public sectors to better understand the nature of the challenges and to promote mechanisms that will help resolve disputes, or maybe even deal with them before they appear. It is important to secure the political space from which these organizations operate.

Nowhere is this more obvious than on gender issues, where women can play a key role in promoting peace and reconciliation with strong and sustained support from Ministers concerned, UN Women and UNMIL. With the PBF increasing its allocation for gender-related activities in Liberia above the 15-per cent target set by the Secretary-General, the Government and partners have every reason to step up their efforts to ensure that women can play the necessary role in building sustainable peace in Liberia.

The Liberian agenda for transformation, together with the Government's commitment to elaborating a new deal compact, should provide a continued and strengthened focus on all five State-building and peacebuilding goals, including those covered by the statement of mutual commitments. The PBC should contribute to this effort and ensure that its work supports national ownership and is aligned with such jointly elaborated mechanisms.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Mr. Tillander for his briefing.

I now invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion on the subject.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.

United Nations
S/PV.7146

Security Council

Sixty-ninth year

Provisional

7146th meeting

Thursday, 20 March 2014, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Lucas	(Luxembourg)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Perceval
	Australia	Mr. Quinlan
	Chad	Mr. Mangaral
	Chile	Mr. Gálvez
	China	Mr. Wang Min
	France	Mr. Bertoux
	Jordan	Mr. Omaish
	Lithuania	Mrs. Kazragienė
	Nigeria	Mr. Sarki
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Oh Joon
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Rwanda	Mr. Nduhungirehe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Mrs. DiCarlo

Agenda

Non-proliferation

Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Accessible document
Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Non-proliferation

Briefing by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006)

The President (*spoke in French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Ambassador Gary Quinlan, Permanent Representative of Australia, in his capacity as Chair of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006).

I now give the floor to Ambassador Quinlan.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I have the honour to present the report of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006), in accordance with paragraph 18 (h) of that resolution. The present report covers the period from 13 December 2013 to 19 March 2014, during which time the Committee held two informal meetings and one informal informal meeting, and conducted additional work using the no-objection procedure envisaged in paragraph 15 of the guidelines for the conduct of the Committee's work.

The Committee presented its annual report to the President of the Council on 27 December last year. The annual report provides a useful snapshot of the range of activities pursued by the Committee in accordance with its mandate over that year.I would particularly like to highlight the Committee's communications with Member States and international organizations on matters of implementation and compliance. Providing guidance to Member States that request assistance with their implementation of the relevant provisions of the key resolutions is obviously a critical dimension of the Committee's programme of work. I encourage all Member States to take us up on our offer.

Another aspect of our work, highlighted in the 2013 annual report, is the reports from Member States themselves of action they have taken to enforce the sanctions measures. Some of the cases related to violations of national implementation measures investigated by local enforcement authorities; for others, the Member State concerned invited the Panel of Experts to investigate the incident, in particular those that appeared to be a breach by Iran of its obligations under the resolutions. I cannot overstate the importance to the Committee's work of these incident reports and the willingness of Member States to invite the Panel of Experts to participate in the investigation of such incidents.

The Committee twice reached out to Iran last year in relation to incidents investigated by the Panel of Experts. We wrote on 12 April 2013 in relation to the Panel's unanimous conclusion that Iran's launches of the Shahab-1 and Shahab-3 missiles during the Great Prophet VII exercises contravened paragraph 9 of resolution 1929 (2010), and on 21 May 2013 in relation to the Panel's conclusion that an intercepted arms shipment in Yemen was at the very least a probable violation by Iran of paragraph 5 of resolution 1747 (2007). Iran has still not replied, and the Committee continues to call on Iran to do so.

Although the Committee remains mindful of ongoing talks between the P5+1 and Iran following the joint plan of action agreed in Geneva on 24 November 2013, the work of both the Committee and the Panel of Experts remains unchanged for 2014. As I mentioned during my last report in December 2013 (see S/PV.7082), the Security Council measures imposed by resolutions 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008) and 1929 (2010) remain in effect, and Member States continue to have an obligation to implement them duly.

The Committee adopted its programme of work for the period 1 January to 30 June 2014 on 24 January and has already been actively engaged with Member States.

The Committee received multiple communications from several Member States, updating the Committee on the outcome of enforcement actions they had taken. One Member State reported on the steps it had taken to prevent multiple attempts in 2011 and 2012 by Iran to procure carbon fibre, suspected of being in violation of relevant Security Council resolutions. Another Member State informed the Committee of the confirmation of the judgement against a person found guilty of violating its laws implementing the Council's sanctions on Iran. The Committee continued to consider its response to the report by the Panel of Experts, which had concluded that Iran's attempted procurement of carbon fibre in December 2012 — those goods were intercepted and seized by a Member State — contravened the resolutions.

The Permanent Representative of a Member State, named in media reports as having contracted to procure arms from Iran, in contravention of paragraph 5 of resolution 1747 (2007) , called on me in my capacity as Chair of the Committee to deny the reports. The Permanent Mission also sent a note verbale to the Committee in similar terms. The Panel of Experts is separately engaging with the Member State concerned on those reports.

During the reporting period, the Committee responded to requests for guidance from Member States covering a range of issues, ranging from notification requirements and engagement with the originating State of seized items to the supply of target-shooting ammunition to Iran for sport shooting purposes, and updated lists of designated individuals, entities and goods to which the sanctions apply. The Committee is also working with an international organization on clarifying whether a particular proposal for technical assistance to Iran is compatible with the sanctions regime.

The Committee has also engaged with a number of Member States over the past three months on the implementation of the targeted financial sanctions regime. The Committee provided additional identifying information of a listed individual from publicly available sources, including photographs, to assist a Member State in clarifying a possible match. The Committee similarly responded to another State's request for assistance in determining whether particular entities were included in the Committee's consolidated list.

The Committee itself received assistance from a Member State, which transmitted to us a list of persons who had travelled through the country with names similar to those of listed individuals and provided additional identifying information for those possible matches that was missing from the Committee's consolidated list, such as birth dates and passport numbers. That data will allow the Committee to determine whether any of the individuals were indeed listed individuals travelling in contravention of the travel ban and, in that case, to strengthen the effectiveness of both the ban and targeted financial sanctions by including the new identifying data in the consolidated list.

As we are approaching the end of the current mandate of the Panel of Experts and the submission of its final report in May, I thought it would be timely to inform the Council of the outcome of the Committee's deliberations on the Panel's recommendations to the Committee from its report of May 2013.

The Panel's first recommendation was to designate an entity the Panel found to be in violation of paragraph 12 of resolution 1929 (2010) for procuring valves for use in the Arak heavy water reactor. The Committee stands ready to consider such a designation if and when a Member State puts the designation to the Committee, as required by the Committee's guidelines.

Secondly, the Panel recommended that the Committee encourage States to be alert to attempted procurement of any items destined for an end use prohibited by the resolutions. That is a reference to the fact that the obligation to prevent the supply to Iran of all items that could contribute to Iran's prohibited nuclear and missile-related activities applies not only to items included in the lists named in the resolutions and updated by the Committee, but to any further items if the Member State determines that they could contribute to those prohibited activities. The Committee continues to discuss whether some form of written guidance for Member States on that obligation is necessary. In the meantime, we encourage any Member State with questions concerning the scope of the obligation to contact the Committee.

The Panel's third recommendation related to vessels under the control of the Irano Hind Shipping Company, which is a designated entity under sanctions. The company was dissolved by its joint venture partners in the first part of 2013, preventing the Committee from taking up the recommendation.

Fourthly, the Panel recommended that the Committee consider providing guidance to States on how to implement aspects of the targeted financial sanctions that extend the application of the measures to agents and affiliates of designated persons and entities. Noting that the language identified in the recommendation is used in targeted financial sanctions under other Council resolutions, the Committee has been reluctant to consider the question unilaterally. However, we have begun a process of consultation with other relevant sanctions committees to consider the issue collectively.

The Panel's fifth recommendation was for the Committee to provide guidance on the modalities surrounding a State's inspection of cargoes and possible seizing of goods suspected to be in contravention of the resolutions, including such matters as timing and content of reports to the Committee and inviting inspection by the Panel. The Committee is developing text to include in the Committee's Fact Sheet and other relevant Committee documents.

Finally, the Panel recommended that the Committee address discrepancies in the list where designated individuals no longer hold the positions identified in those designations. The Committee is taking that forward as part of the comprehensive review of the Committee's list mentioned in part 1 of the Committee's work programme.

Just before concluding, I would like to turn now to conditional exceptions to the ban on supplying nuclear-related items to Iran, notably in relation to items for light water reactors, which the Council considers to be less proliferation-sensitive than heavy water reactors. The Committee must be notified of supplies to Iran of items falling under the exception and, during the reporting period, the Committee received one such notification by a Member State concerning the delivery of items for reactor unit 1 of the Bushehr nuclear power plant.

With regard to the obligation of Member States to freeze assets on their territory that are owned or controlled by a person or entity listed by the Council or the Committee and to prevent any assets being made available to such persons or entities, the Committee received one notification from a Member State pursuant to paragraph 15 of resolution 1737 (2006) and paragraph 4 of resolution 1747 (2007), which allow for payments owed by a listed person or entity under a contract entered into prior to the listing to be made from that person or entity's frozen funds, subject to notification to the Committee.

I should note, in concluding, that a slightly more detailed version of this report will be available online. I might also note that we will continue to make efforts to try to "de-dry" these reports in the future, but there are certain legal obligations according to which the Committee is required to transmit certain information to the public in an ordinary meeting of the Security Council.

The President (*spoke in French*): I thank Ambassador Quinlan for his briefing and for his efforts to "de-dry", as he says, the report.

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I thank the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006), under the chairmanship of Ambassador Gary Quinlan, and the Panel of Experts for their continued to work in supporting implementation of the Security Council's resolutions on Iran. The report may be dry, but the work that the Committee does is very important.

On 24 November 2013, the E3+3 and Iran reached an important and encouraging milestone, when a first stage agreement was reached on the nuclear issue. Since then, a first round of talks on a comprehensive agreement was held in Vienna in February, where there was a willingness and a commitment from all sides to negotiate in good faith. Those talks continued in a positive atmosphere earlier this week.

The interim agreement was a significant step forward and allows for time to negotiate a comprehensive solution. In January, the United States and the European Union delivered the sanctions relief, and we welcome the latest report by the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, dated 20 February, which confirms that Iran has continued to implement the nuclear measures agreed under the joint plan of action.

Meanwhile and importantly, the bulk of sanctions remain in place, including all United Nations sanctions. We should continue to robustly enforce those sanctions to ensure that economic pressure continues to act as a peaceful incentive for Iran to negotiate a comprehensive solution.

Turning to the work of the Committee, we are concerned by breaches and possible breaches by Iran of its international obligations. Reports that a cargo ship, the *Klos C*, was found to have dozens of Iranian-supplied rockets on board in hidden containers, are deeply worrying, including the fact that the final destination appears to have been the Gaza Strip. That not the first time that we have seen reports of potential arms transfers to Gaza involving Iran. We would like to the Panel of Experts investigate the circumstances of the case, identify individuals and entities responsible, and make recommendations to the Committee, as appropriate.

In January 2013, the report of the Panel of Experts clearly and unanimously concluded that Iran's ballistic missile launched last year consituted a violation of resolution 1929 (2010). The Committee contacted Iran twice on the issue, but Iran has yet to respond.

As that report recalls, Iran has also not replied to the Committee regarding a request for information on an intercepted arms shipment to Yemen. We call on Iran to engage with the Committee on such incidents.

We are concerned that Iran continues to provide substantial military and financial support to Hizbollah and the Syrian regime, in contravention of the United Nations embargo on the export of weapons by Iran. We urge Member States to continue to enforce the sanctions regime and encourage Member States to act on and report all suspected violations of those sanctions.

We look forward to the Panel of Experts' final report in May.

The United Kingdom is committed to finding a peaceful, negotiated solution with Iran on the nuclear issue. That will be a long-term process. We do not expect instant results, but we remain fully committed to finding a diplomatic solution. The Geneva agreement and ongoing negotiations are the best opportunity we have for real and sustainable progress. All sides must continue to make every effort to succeed.

Mr. Bertoux (France) (*spoke in French*): I thank Ambassador Quinlan and his team for the quarterly activity report that has just been presented to us.

For over 10 years now, the Iranian nuclear programme and the uncertainties about its exclusively peaceful purposes have been a matter of concern to the international community and a threat to peace and international security. For 10 years, the Council has in vain called on Iran to negotiate. Each time, we have been confronted with their refusal to engage in dialogue and a jump forward in their nuclear and missile programmes. That led the Council to establish a sanctions regime while continuing to call on Iran to negotiate. That so-called dual approach and the new attitude of the authorities in Tehran finally brought about a substantive discussion with Iran on the nuclear issue.

The adoption of the joint action plan on 24 November 2013, the implementation of which began in January, was a step forward for peace and security. For the first time, the E3+3 got Iran to suspend the most sensitive activities of its nuclear programme for six months. The negotiations were thus given more time. The dialogue is just beginning. The joint action plan is only an interim agreement. The mandate that was given to the P5+1 by the Council is to find a long-term solution to the Iranian nuclear programme with a view to restoring confidence in its exclusively peaceful purpose. That is the direction and purpose of talks between Iran and the P5+1 that were just held in Vienna and will continue at the beginning of April. We approach them with an open mind, but also with vigilance.

Progress has finally been made in the dialogue between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Director General has stated, in his report of 20 February and in the report published just today in Vienna, that Iran has met its commitments under the joint action plan with the P5+1. He also stated that Iran has implemented the confidence-building measures contained in the former agreement with the Agency on 11 November. That is a positive development, but not all the issues have been resolved — far from it. To achieve a long-term solution, it remains essential that Iran clarify all outstanding issues related to the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programme. Iran knows that and will need to provide answers.

Finally, I would recall that the joint action plan does not in any way do away with the sanctions regime against Iran imposed by the Security Council, which must be fully implemented while awaiting a comprehensive settlement of the crisis. It is therefore with concern that we read the reports that, on 5 March, the Israeli navy intercepted a large shipment of arms, probably of Iranian origin, destined for Gaza. The Panel will have to confirm the origin of those weapons, but if that is indeed the case, it would be a violation of the arms embargo imposed under resolution 1747 (2007), which might call into question Iran's good faith in its stated willingness to address the concerns of the Security Council. We hope that the Committee's Panel of Experts will be able to quickly engage in a dialogue with Israel and Iran in order to shed light on this matter.

On the work of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006), which Ambassador Quinlan has just briefed us on, I regret that the experts' recommendations that are contained in last year's final report (S/2013/331, annex) have not been fully implemented. They are nonetheless simple and operational recommendations aimed at making the sanctions system more effective. We will have to redouble our efforts so that, by our next meeting, progress can made in this area.

Mr. Wang Min (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I would like to thank Ambassador Quinlan for his briefing and commend him for the enormous efforts he has made to push forward the work of the Security Council

Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006).

China has always attached great importance to the work of the Committee and stands ready to work with the Chair in implementing the various activities of the Committee in a balanced, orderly and prudent manner. It has been China's consistent view that all parties are duty-bound to implement the Security Council's resolutions on sanctions against Iran in an accurate, comprehensive and faithful manner. But sanctions are not an end in themselves. The work of both the Committee and the Council is to serve the goal of achieving diplomatic solutions. It is hoped that the Committee will follow the resolution's mandate, apply the principles of objectivity, fairness and pragmatism and, on the basis of clear facts, solid evidence and extensive consultations, properly deal with the individual cases of suspected sanctions violations. China will act on the basis of the aforementioned principles and participate in the work of the Committee in a responsible manner.

China recognizes the positive momentum demonstrated by the latest diplomatic efforts and welcomes the fact that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has maintained consultations with Iran on outstanding issues concerning Iran's nuclear programme and reached agreement on the steps to be taken in the future. As the first stage agreements between the P5+1 and Iran have been successfully implemented, the negotiations on a comprehensive agreement have unfolded and the dialogue with Iran has entered a new stage. Following the recently concluded first round of dialogue, the P5+1 and Iran have conducted interactive and frank exchanges on questions of mutual concern and have reached consensus. In spite of remaining differences on some issues, all parties concerned have demonstrated the will to address the concerns of the other side. That will help them to continue to seek common ground and resolve their differences.

With the deepeneing of negotiations, however, the dialogue process will face increasing challenges ahead. Therefore, China proposes the following: first, to continue the process of the P5+1 dialogue with Iran and bring that mechanism into full play through joint commitment and consultations on an equal footing in order to resolve the issue peacefully; secondly, to reach a comprehensive, fair and reasonable long-term solution that accommodates the concerns of all parties; thirdly, to try to follow the principle of step-by-step reciprocity and enhnace mutual trust by meeting each other half way, in order to create favourable conditions for achieving a breakgrhough; fourthly, to create a viable atmosphere for dialogue and negotiations by demonstrating good faith and maintaining confidence and patience; and, fifthly, while focusing on addressing the Iranian nuclear issue itself, we should adopt a new security concept featuring mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination, engage in constructive multilateral and bilateral cooperation and find a comprehensive solution that addresses the issue by looking into both the root causes and the symptoms.

China has always endeavoured to promote dialogue in an impartial and responsible manner. It will participate in the dialogue in a constructive manner and wor tirelessly for the comprehensive implementation of the resolution.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We thank Ambassador Gary Quinlan for his briefing on the work of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006), which he chairs. In our view, the very dry nature of his briefing is what makes it stand out.

Russian diplomacy has, over many years, worked very actively to achieve fair agreements on the Iranian nuclear programme on the basis of the step-by-step reciprocity spelled out by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey V. Lavrov. We are satisfied that those efforts have yielded results and that on 24 November 2013, a breakthrough agreement — and that is not an exaggeration — was reached between the P5+1, the international mediators and Iran. That agreement recognized the unquestionable right of Iran to develop a peaceful nuclear programme, including uranium enrichment, subject to the understanding that outstanding issues around it will be resolved and that the programme itself will be placed under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

It is also important that the aforementioned agreement presupposes a weakening of the sanctions regime against Iran. It is gratifying that the suspension of unilateral sanctions, the legitimacy of which were never recognized, and which have had a long-standing negative impact on the socioeconomic position of the Iranian people, has already started.

In that context, the ultimate goal is of course the lifting of all sanctions — those imposed both by the Security Council resolutions and unilaterally — once a basic agreement on the final settlement of the Iranian nuclear programme has been achieved. All sides must implement the Geneva plan of action in good faith and actively work to draft, by 20 July, a final package that would allow for an early and comprehensive settlement of issues surrounding the Iranian nuclear programme on the basis of compromises in all areas.

In that regard, we welcome the second comprehensive round of negotiations between the P5+1 and the Islamic Republic of Iran, held in Vienna from 17 to 19 March. It was useful and affirmed the mutual readiness to continue contructive cooperation and comprehensive talks. There was an in-depth discussion of the sanctions issues, Iranian enrichment activities and international cooperation with Iran on peaceful nuclear energy, and on how to allay concerns over the heavy water reactor in Arak. The P5+1 and Iran agreed to continue comprehensive talks at the political and technical levels.

The next round of expert consultations will be held at the beginning of April, following which another comprehensive round of negotiations will be held in Vienna from 7 to 9 April. Such a tight schedule gives the necessary positive momentum to the process for us to focus our work on those aspects where there are the greatest differences exist and to move towards resolving them.

The increased cooperation between Iran and the IAEA is promising. That cooperation has reached a new stage and provides for Iran's implementation of good-faith transparency measures that go beyond its commitments in the framework of the IAEA guarantees. We hope that the IAEA will close the Iranian dossier in the near future and cooperate with that country in the normal way.

We are convinced that the current sensitive stage of the international community's work must be tailored to promoting a positive negotiation process between the P5+1 and Iran. That is what guides our work in the 1737 Committee. In the current critical stage, it is particularly important that the Committee and its Panel of Experts continue to act in an unbiased, balanced and objective way in order to promote a political and diplomatic settlement with regard to the Iranian nuclear programme.

We are convinced that progress on the Iranian issue will have a positive impact on the situation throughout the Middle East and help to overcome the dangerous trend of recent years, when there were attempts to resolve a number of crisis situations by using force. For our part, we will continue to spare no effort to achieve a final comprehensive solution to issues related to the Iranian nuclear programme. We hope that hasty actions by some partners of the P5+1 will not lead to a loss of coordination in that very important mechanism.

Mrs. DiCarlo (United States of America): I thank Ambassador Quinlan for his briefing and for his able leadership of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006). His work on the issue under consideration has particular value at this time. Today, I would like to touch on three reasons why. The first reason relates to the ongoing P5+1 talks, the second to troubling signs of sanctions violations, and the third to the important roles of the Committee and the Panel of Experts, which is set to begin work on its next report, the details of which will be essential.

On the nuclear talks with the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Security Council has a clear stake in the outcome. The Council has imposed four rounds of sanctions in response to Iran's failure to adhere to its nuclear obligations. Any deal with Iran must squarely address the many Security Council resolutions on that matter. That is a key principle of the joint plan of action. It is critical that all Member States continue to fully implement the sanctions on Iran. The full implementation of the sanction regime will support the diplomacy and limit Iran's illicit smuggling of arms, funds and technology.

In that regard, we find the recent indications of serious violations of United Nations sanctions troubling. Earlier this month, Israel announced that it had stopped a massive shipment of rockets, mortars and ammunition that Iran was smuggling to Gaza militants. We call on the Committee, with the support of the Panel, to investigate all aspects of that incident. The Committee should also be prepared to impose real consequences, such as possible sanctions designations, on those responsible.

At the same time, reports that Iran sought to transfer arms to Iraq, in violation of resolution 1737 (2006), are alarming. We note that the Iraqi authorities have committed publicly to fully respecting all relevant resolutions, which is welcome. In that connection, we encourage the Committee and the Panel, in cooperation with the Iraqi authorities, to investigate those reports and affirm full compliance with resolution 1737 (2006).

That leads me to my last point on the important roles of the Committee and the Panel. As a rule, if and when violations such as those mentioned above occur, the Council's Iran Sanctions Committee has the responsibility to tighten enforcement. We look to the Committee to step up efforts to help States implement the sanctions and to be ready to respond to all reports of sanctions non-compliance. In addition, it is essential the the Panel continue its full travel schedule and continue to raise awareness about the sanctions.

In that context, as the Panel begins its work to draft its next annual report, we encourage it to present as much information as possible on sanctions compliance. We commend the Panel for its independent reporting and urge it to continue its cooperation with Member States and the Committee. The Committee needs to know the names of violators and their methods. We also encourage the Panel to ensure that its report has specific and implementable recommendations that can tangibly improve sanctions implementation. The Panel's recent recommendations, which were specific in nature, enabled the Committee to engage in productive discussions and assess how best to move forward.

The United States looks forward to continung its work with the Committee as we address the challenges and issues raised here today. Monitoring implementation, a quick response to violations and cooperation with the Panel are fundamental to the success of the sanctions and to supporting our negotiators as they seek a comprehensive solution.

Mr. Gálvez (Chile) (spoke in Spanish): We thank Ambassador Quinlan for presenting the quarterly report on the work of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006). We value the work of Ambassador Quinlan as Chair of that Committee.

Given that this is our first opportunity to participate in a briefing by the Chairman of the 1737 Committee, I would like to say that my country welcomes the agreement between the P5+1 and Iran of 24 November 2013 and the cooperation agreement between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). They provide a unique opportunity for Iran to prove the peaceful nature of its nuclear programme.

Chile welcomes with satisfaction the most recent report of the Director General of the IAEA of 20 February on the implementation of the NPT safeguards agreement and relevant provisions of Security Council resolutions in the Islamic Republic of Iran. We particularly welcome the fact that the highly enriched uranium reserves have been significantly reduced pursuant to the 24 November agreement and that the IAEA recognizes that Iran is meeting its commitments to slow down its most sensitive nuclear activities in exchange for the lifting of some economic sanctions.

Our country follows such reports with interest, but also with caution. Our country notes the issues raised by the various delegations during the Committee's consultations in the recent quarter. In particular, we note the view that, in the context of the ongoing talks between the P5+1 and Iran, it is not advisable to take steps that could threaten the current momentum in the dialogue.

Chile understands that we are not working in a political vacuum and that any kind of action that could be misunderstood by the parties should be avoided. However, until a final and satisfactory agreement is reached and endorsed by the Security Council, the measures imposed by the United Nations with regard to Iran's nuclear programme will remain in effect.

In that context, my country expresses its strong support for the 1737 Committee and its Panel of Experts, and hopes that its work will not be impeded and that it will able to fully fulfil its mandate in a timely and effective manner. That is particularly relevant given the recently reported incident in the Red Sea, where a ship carrying ballistic missiles, apparently of Iranian origin and destined for the Gaza Strip, was intercepted. We hope that the Panel of Experts will be able to begin to collect information on that case as soon as possible in order to gather objective data to enable us to decide whether or not it was a violation of the relevant resolutions.

In conclusion, Chile expresses its vote of confidence that the spirit of collaboration and commitment observed on the part of the Government in Tehran in its dialogue with the P5+1 with regard to its nuclear programme will be reflected in other equally pressing matters in the Middle East, in which Iran plays an important role.

Mr. Oh Joon (Republic of Korea): I would like to thank Ambassador Quinlan for his briefing on the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006). We greatly appreciate his able leadership and the Panel of Experts for their robust activities.

Let me begin by reiterating my Government's support for the joint plan of action agreed between the P5+1 and Iran last November. We welcome the initiation of the implementation of the agreed measures since January. We are keenly watching the negotiations towards a comprehensive resolution of the Iranian nuclear issue. We hope the process can have a positive influence on other outstanding non-proliferation issues. We also underline the importance of the IAEA's role in resolving all present and past issues, including the possible military dimensions of the Iranian nuclear programme.

With regard to today's briefing, we consider it important that the obligations set out in the Security Council resolutions remain in full force and be faithfully implemented by all Member States. As highlighted in the briefing, we think the various communications received from Member States and international organizations indicate the importance of the Committee's work and its role in the sanctions regime. We look forward to the Panel's new final report with high expectations, which will shed further light on the implementation of the Security Council resolutions.

Finally, we note that, as mentioned in the briefing, there are important overdue pending issues on violation cases. There are also some recommendations from last year's final report that have not yet been fully implemented. We encourage all Committee members to strengthen cooperation to find common ground and practical solutions to move those pending issues forward before the next report is submitted.

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to thank Ambassador Quinlan for presenting the quarterly report on the work of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) and for his dedicated and devoted leadership of the Committee.

We have received the most recent report of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), dated 20 February. In that regard, I would like to underscore that, according to the report, in the specified three-month period, Iran implemented the initial practical measures contained in the annex to the framework for cooperation with the IAEA. Moreover, we believe that it is auspicious that the Agency and Iran have agreed to the next seven steps to be implemented before 15 May and that the report also recognizes that Iran has fulfilled its obligations with regard to the measures of the joint action plan agreed with the P5+1.

As we said in the Council in December (see S/PV.7082) and in other forums, we understand that the agreement between the P5+1 and Iran reaffirms the value of diplomatic measures and represents a significant step forward in the area of Iran's nuclear programme. We therefore congratulate the Governments of the United States, Iran, France, China, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and Germany on the entry into force of the agreement on 20 January.

We are also pleased that the P5+1 and Iran have requested the IAEA to carry out the nuclear energy-related monitoring and verification activities that are necessary in order to implement the joint action plan, and that the Board of Governors of the IAEA approved the Agency's carrying out of those tasks at its session in January. In that regard, we believe it important for the Agency to have the necessary capacity to carry out its work effectively.

While we welcome the progress achieved in recent months in the negotiations, we have taken careful note of the Director General's conclusion that there is still much to be done to resolve pending issues. In that regard, we believe that it is essential that Iran cooperate actively with the Agency on all pending issues, particularly with regard to the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programme — on which there has not yet been significant concrete progress, according to the report — and that it comply with its obligations, including Security Council resolutions.

With regard to the Committee's work, as Ambassador Quinlan indicated the sanctions imposed by the Security Council are still in effect and should be implemented by Member States. In that regard, I reiterate my delegation's concern with regard to the quality of the lists of persons and entities subject to sanctions developed by some Committees. We stress the importance of entries being supported by sufficient data to allow Member States to properly identify them in applying sanctions. For that reason, we support the Chair's efforts to improve the quality of the Committee's list and, consequently, the sanctions' effectiveness.

Mr. Omaish (Jordan) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation welcomes the efforts of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) in assisting States and international organizations with issues related to the implementation of the resolutions imposing sanctions on Iran by providing guidance and answers to States' technical questions on the timeliness and accuracy of the implementation of the resolutions.

We encourage the Committee to continue conducting the necessary investigations of violations and to assess opportunities for ongoing engagement with the Iranian Government with a view to clarifying pending questions regarding violations cited in the report, especially with respect to the prohibited missiles launched during the Great Prophet VII military exercises, and to the arms shipment that was seized on 23 January 2013 aboard a vessel en route to Yemen.

We appreciate the Committee's efforts to consult with other sanctions committees in issuing guidance to States on the implementation of targeted financial sanctions.

Finally, we welcome the conclusion of the Geneva agreement on the joint action plan between Iran and the P5+1. However, at the same time, we urge the Committee to carry on its mandated tasks to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. Sarki (Nigeria): I, too, thank the Chair of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006), the Permanent Representative of Australia, for his briefing. The report that was presented to the Council today, which he described as dry but not entirely devoid of interest, addresses the issues of implementation and compliance as they affect the mandate of the 1737 Committee. We note and welcome the willingness of Member States and international organizations to invite the Panel of Experts to assist in the investigation of cases related to violations of national implementation of sanctions measures.

We commend the Committee's continued provision of guidance, assistance and timely responses to Member States and international organizations in the verification of the compatibility of requests with the sanctions regime. Those actions are clearly demonstrated in the reported cases, including those received from Hungary, Sweden, Kuwait, Argentina, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. We also welcome the assistance provided to the Committee through the transmission of useful information by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

We urge the Islamic Republic of Iran to respond to the Committee's letter of 12 April 2013 in relation to the Panel's conclusion that it had launched Shahab-1 and Shahab-3 ballistic missiles in contravention of resolution 1929 (2010). The Islamic Republic of Iran should also respond to the Committee's letter of 21 May 2013 in relation to the Panel's conclusion concerning an arms shipment intercepted in Yemen, which represents a probable violation by Iran of resolution 1747 (2007).

We note and welcome the cooperation the Committee has received from Member States that have updated the Committee on enforcement actions they have taken. We see merit in the Panel's recommendation that the Committee encourage States to be alert to the procurement of items destined for an end use prohibited by relevant resolutions. We commend the Committee for launching a consultative process with other relevant sanctions committees to consider the implementation of targeted financial sanctions against agents and affiliates of designated persons.

Finally, we would like to commend the Permanent Representative of Australia for his astute leadership of the 1737 Committee.

Mrs. Kazragienė (Lithuania): I would like to thank Ambassador Quinlan for his quarterly briefing and to commend the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006) and its Panel of Experts for their important and dedicated work.

Lithuania remains concerned about the nature of Iran's nuclear programme and its failure to comply with numerous resolutions of the Security Council and the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) obliging Iran to suspend all reprocessing, heavy water and enrichment-related activities. In his latest report, the Director General of the IAEA has once again noted that the Agency was not in a position to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran was used for peaceful activities and that it remained concerned about the possible undisclosed military dimension of Iran's nuclear programmes.

At the same time, we welcome the 24 November 2013 plan of action agreed by the E3+3 and Iran as the first confidence-building step. We further call on Iran to engage constructively with the E3+3 in reaching a comprehensive agreement on all outstanding issues and welcome another round of talks that took place on 18 and 19 March in Vienna. We are encouraged by the fact that the six initial practical measures foreseen in the framework for cooperation between the IAEA and Iran have been implemented. We also welcome the agreement on the next seven practical measures. The overarching goal of the ongoing negotiations is to build mutual trust and confidence that Iran will not be able to build nuclear weapons, in return for which the economic and financial sanctions be lifted.

Pending the comprehensive solution of the Iranian nuclear issue, all Security Council sanctions imposed on Iran remain in effect. Iran is required to cooperate fully with the international community on all outstanding issues before the measures imposed by the Security Council can be lifted. Member States, in their turn, are obliged to rigorously implement the sanctions regime. Their Government and private entities, as well as their nationals, must strictly adhere to restrictions related to engagement with their partners and Iran. The work of both the Committee and the Panel of Experts in verifying compliance with relevant Security Council measures should therefore remain unaffected.

As the next annual report of the Committee's Panel of Experts is due in May, we need to make sure that all relevant recommendations contained in the 2014 report are duly addressed. In that regard, we welcome discussions on the implementation assistance notice related to a catch-all clause, and hope for speedier progress following the adoption of a notice related to an equivalent provision of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1718 (2006).

Iran's repeated violations of the conventional arms embargo are a matter of great concern. Despite the complete ban on the export of any arms from Iran and the ban on the supply of major conventional weapons to Iran, there have been reports of weapons transfers to Syria, to non-State actors in Gaza, and to a number of States. The Committee's letter regarding the seizure by Yemeni authorities of arms and related material has gone unanswered by Iran since May 2013. Recent official reports on the interception of a vessel allegedly carrying weapons to Gaza are also worrying and need to be investigated by the Committee and its Panel of Experts without delay.

Lithuania supports all efforts geared to finding a comprehensive negotiated solution to the Iranian nuclear issue that would fully reassure the international community of the exclusively peaceful nature of its nuclear programme. It is the hope of my delegation that Iran's recent engagement in E3+3 talks will also translate into its meaningful cooperation with the Committee.

Mr. Nduhungirehe (Rwanda): Allow me to start by thanking Ambassador Gary Quinlan of Australia for his update of the 90-day report and for his able leadership of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006). We encourage the Committee this year to continue working with Member States seeking guidance on the implementation of the sanctions regime. With the continued support of the Panel of Experts, Member States can be reassured of proper guidance towards implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

We would like to reiterate our belief in the three pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: non-proliferation, disarmament and the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In our view, every country has the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and in this context Rwanda appreciates the current positive momentum in the talks between the P5+1 and Iran. We take note of the initial steps taken and commitments undertaken by the Islamic Republic of Iran towards the implementation of the joint plan of action adopted in Geneva on 24 November 2013, and we hope that Tehran will continue fulfilling its obligations in that respect. We welcome the current spirit in ongoing negotiations aimed at reaching a comprehensive agreement that could permanently remove the threat that the Iranian nuclear programme poses to the countries of the region.

In the meantime, the sanctions regime remains in place, and the 1737 Committee shall continue to implement relevant resolutions of the Security Council with the assistance of the Panel of Experts. However, we urge all stakeholders — in particular, members of the P5+1 — to avoid any decision that could undermine the current talks. As stated by the Committee Chair, last year Iran did not reply to two letters from the Committee regarding an incident investigated by the Panel of Experts — the letter dated 12 April 2013, on the launched of the Shahab-1 and Shahab-3 missiles during the Great Prophet VII exercises, in contravention of resolution 1929 (2010), and the letter 21 May, 2013, on an intercepted arms shipment in Yemen, in probably violation of resolution 1747 (2007). We hope that the Iranian Government will have a better approach towards the Committee in 2014, which could amplify the current positive momentum.

Similarly, Rwanda is concerned at reported violations of the sanctions regime by Member States and other entities. It is important for all actors to implement the sanctions regime in good faith and to work towards negotiated solutions. In that regard, we are concerned over reports on the interception in the

Red Sea by Israeli forces of a ship transporting ballistic missiles, reportedly of Iranian origin, to the Gaza Strip. We hope that the Panel of Experts will carry out a proper investigation in that regard.

In conclusion, Rwanda looks forward to the final report of the Panel of Experts to be submitted in May. We hope that with the implementation of the Geneva joint plan of action, the progress in the current talks for the comprehensive agreement and the full collaboration with the 1737 Committee, the Islamic Republic of Iran and other international stakeholders could play an important in ensuring that all sanctions that continue to harm the Iranian people are permanently lifted.

Mr. Mangaral (Chad) (*spoke in French*): I thank the Chair of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006), Ambassador Gary Quinlan, for his quarterly report on the activities of the Committee. I welcome his emphasis on strengthening communications between the Committee and Member States and international organizations with regard to the implementation of the provisions of resolutions and the importance he attaches to contacts with Member States. Indeed, it was such communication that allowed Member States to receive reports on the measures taken by national structures or thanks to assistance from the Panel of Experts of the Committee, as contained in the Committee's annual report.

My country congratulates the Committee on its adoption of its biannual plan of work and takes note of the six recommendations of its Panel of Experts.

In conclusion, I note that, in the light of the launching of a Shahab-3 missile by Iran, in violation of paragraph 9 of resolution 1929 (2010), according to the Panel of Experts, and the interception of an arms shipment in Yemen, which the Committee characterized as a probable violation by Iran of paragraph 5 of resolution 1747 (2007), the Committee should continue to communicate with Iran seeking responses to its concerns. Likewise, the ongoing talks between the P5+1 and Iran, following the Geneva joint plan of action of 24 November 2013, must continue and produce positive results.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall now make a statement in my national capacity as the representative of Luxembourg.

I, too, thank Ambassador Gary Quinlan for his briefing and for the commitment he and his team have shown in leading the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1737 (2006). The quarterly report that he presented to the Council today shows that the Committee continues to perform important work in support of the resolutions of the Security Council. Luxembourg also expresses its appreciation to the Panel of Experts created by resolution 1929 (2010) for the valuable support it provides to the work of the 1737 Committee.

The interim agreement adopted on 24 November last year in Geneva was an important step. For the first time in a decade, it was possible to reach a detailed agreement addressing the most concerning elements of the Iranian nuclear programme. We welcome once again the energy and determination of the High Representative of the European Union, Catherine Ashton, whose role in the negotiations between Iran and the E3+3 continues to be central.

The implementation of the joint plan of action defined by the interim agreement began on 20 January. Negotiations aimed at a comprehensive long-term solution have also begun, addressing the most crucial questions, including uranium enrichment to 20 per cent, the development of advanced centrifuges, and the Arak heavy water reactor. Any comprehensive long-term solution must take the resolutions of the Security Council into due account — a principle that figures explicitly in the plan of action.

Reaching a comprehensive solution is a difficult and laborious process. We expect Iran to act in good faith and to cooperate actively with the international community. We note with interest the latest report of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), dated 20 February, on the implementation of safeguards agreements under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and of the provisions of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. For the first time, the report also notes the progress made in implementing the cooperation framework agreed between the Agency and Iran on 11 November last year and the interim agreement between the E3+3 and Iran.

We welcome the timely implementation by Iran of the initial practical measures emanating from the cooperation framework, as well as the fact that the Agency has been able to begin its monitoring and verification activities with respect to the measures contained in the interim agreement. The development of the cooperation framework between Iran and the IAEA represents an important step forward towards proving the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme. As noted by the IAEA Director General, the measures implemented by Iran and the other commitments it has made are positive developments, but much remains to be done to resolve all outstanding issues related to the possible military dimension of its nuclear programme. We therefore eagerly await further detail from the Agency on the implementation by Iran of the new seven practical steps that it must apply by 15 May, under the cooperation framework.

Restoring the confidence of the international community will require Iran to respect its international obligations under the relevant resolutions of the IAEA Board of Governors and the Security Council. Pending a comprehensive long-term solution, the Security Council's resolutions impose sanctions on Iran, which continue to remain in force, as clearly indicated in the quarterly report of the 1737 Committee. In the last quarter, we learned with deep concern of reports on contracts for arms sales from Iran to Iraq that allegedly were concluded in 2013. We also learned of the interception in the Red Sea on 5 March of an Iranian ship, the *Klos-C*, transporting missiles of Syrian manufacture destined for Gaza. We recall that all imports, all exports and all transfers of any weapons from Iran are prohibited under the relevant Security Council resolutions. In that regard, we look forward with interest to additional clarification to be provided by the parties concerned as well as the Panel of Experts to the Committee.

The confirmed or alleged violations by Iran of the sanctions regime remain a source of grave concern. We regret the fact that the Committee was unable to take decisive measures against reported violations, such as the interception of a shipment of carbon fibre to Iran; the Shahab-1 and Shahab-3 missile launches in 2012 during the Great Prophet VII exercises; and the interception in 2013 of a cargo of arms off the coast of Yemen. The Panel of Experts also plays a key role in helping States that are attempting to implement the sanctions. We commend the work of the Panel to investigate Iran's attempts to circumvent the sanctions. The Committee must strive harder to make this information public and to disseminate best practices to detect and prevent violations.

Luxembourg wishes every success to the negotiators who are trying to reach a comprehensive long-term solution within the allotted time period of six months, as defined in the joint plan of action agreed between Iran and the E3+3 countries. We understand that they will meet from 7 to 9 April in Vienna. Nevertheless, until a comprehensive solution is found, the international community must remain vigilant. All States must fulfil their obligations to effectively and fully implement the sanctions established by the Security Council. In the same spirit, the 1737 Committee and its Panel of Experts must continue their vital twofold work of helping States to better understand and better implement their sanctions work, and of establishing consequences imposed for violations of Security Council resolutions.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.